Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-012
Thursday
21 January 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-012 *21 January 1993*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Russia's Kremenyuk on Significance of START II Treaty *[Moscow International]* 1
Russian Navy Commander Assesses Start II *[INTERFAX]* 1
Ukraine's CNDF Resists Start I Ratification *[INTERFAX]* 2
U.S. Concerns Over Ukraine and START Viewed *[PRAVDA 14 Jan]* 2
Russia Begins Talks With U.S. on Missile Technology *[INTERFAX]* 3
Russia's Glukhikh on Arms Exports, Conversion, Defense *[ITAR-TASS]* 4

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Heads of States and Governments Gather in Minsk 5
Summary of Main Documents *[INTERFAX]* 5
Foreign Ministers Begin Meeting *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
Kozyrev, Kravchenko Comment *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
Strategic Forces To Be Discussed *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
Ukraine, Turkmenistan Oppose Charter *[Russian TV]* 7
Defense Ministers' Meeting Noted *[Moscow International]* 7
Belarus Defense Minister Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 7
Defense Ministers' Agenda Given *[ITAR-TASS]* 8
Yeltsin To Present Proposals *[INTERFAX]* 8
Nuclear Policy Committee To Meet *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
Shaposhnikov on CIS Economic, Military Union *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
Two Forms of Unity Possible *[Moscow Radio]* 9
'Contradictions' With Ukraine Solvable *[INTERFAX]* 10
'Unrepresented' Groups To Meet in The Hague *[INTERFAX]* 10
Black Sea Fleet Commander Urges Upholding Agreements *[Kiev TV]* 11
ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 20 Jan 11
Press Review for 21 Jan 12

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Yeltsin Congratulates Clinton on Inauguration *[ITAR-TASS]* 13
Further on Congratulations *[ITAR-TASS]* 13
Clinton Approach to Russia Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jan]* 13
Clinton's Political Course Options Assessed *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 20 Jan]* 15
Clinton's Chances of 'Fresh Start' Pondered *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jan]* 17
Commentary Views U.S.-Russian Relations Under Clinton *[Moscow International]* 18
Clinton's Effect on U.S.-Russian Ties Viewed *[Moscow International]* 18
Commentary Views Bush's Iraqi 'Heritage' to Clinton *[Moscow International]* 19
Iraqi Envoy to Moscow Holds News Conference *[Moscow International]* 19
Urges Russia To Condemn Allied 'Aggression' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jan]* 20
U.S. Actions, Policy Toward Iraq Questioned *[Moscow Radio]* 20
U.S. Actions Said To Give Husayn 'Moral Superiority' *[KURANTY 19 Jan]* 21
Foreign Ministry Statement on Iraq Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jan]* 21
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Questions Russian Policy on Iraq *[19 Jan]* 22
Foreign Intelligence Delegation Ends U.S. Visit *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
Government Approves Plutonium Sale to U.S. *[ECONOMIC NEWS AGENCY]* 24
U.S. Use of Chinese Rocket Launchers Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jan]* 24
China Denies 8 Jan Attack on Russian Tanker *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Yeltsin, Mongolian President Meet, Sign Documents *[Moscow TV]* 25
Comment on New Treaty *[INTERFAX]* 25

Yeltsin To Visit Mongolia *[INTERFAX]* 25
Yeltsin 'Will Certainly' Visit Japan Later This Year *[INTERFAX]* 26

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Referendum Issues

Vice Presidential Adviser Voices Opinion *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 Jan]* 27
Constituent Assembly Pushes for Referendum *[INTERFAX]* 28
Trade Unions To Help Prepare 11 Apr Referendum *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
Poltoranin Gives News Briefing on Referendum *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 20 Jan]* 28
Rumyantsev Warns of Possible Cancellation *[INTERFAX]* 29
Deputies Call For 'Unlimited' Referendum Rights *[ITAR-TASS]* 29
Impact of Inconclusive Referendum Results Pondered *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 Jan]* 29
Referendum Becoming 'Issue of Power' *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 19 Jan]* 30

Political Issues

Stankevich Opposed to Constituent Assembly Idea *[INTERFAX]* 31
Grants TV Interview *[Moscow TV]* 31
Coalition Says National Salvation Front Actions Unlawful *[INTERFAX]* 33
Civic Union Sees Domestic Situation as Tense *[INTERFAX]* 33
Says President Not Observing Compromise *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Holds Council Meeting *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 Jan]* 34
New Russia Bloc Leaders Set Out Policy *[Russian TV]* 35
Council Submits Plan To Fulfill Congress Resolutions *[INTERFAX]* 35
Yeltsin Signs Decree on Law-Making Procedures *[ITAR-TASS]* 36
Yeltsin Decree on State TV, Radio Company *[Radio Rossii]* 36
Yeltsin Sends Privatization Bill to Parliament *[Moscow TV]* 36
Yeltsin's 1992 Popularity Ratings Cited *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 16 Jan]* 37

Economic Issues

Yeltsin Setting Up 'His Own' Bank *[PRAVDA 16 Jan]* 38
Yeltsin Directive Establishes Social-Production Department *[INTERFAX]* 39
Shumeyko on Reforms, Consolidation of Presidential Power *[ITAR-TASS]* 39
Defends Chernomyrdin Team *[Russian TV]* 40
Chernomyrdin Chairs Presidium Session on Economic Reform *[INTERFAX]* 40
Interviewed on Reform Program *[Moscow TV]* 40
Ministers Discuss Ways To Stabilize Industry *[INTERFAX]* 41
Belitskiy Commentary on Economic Figures *[Moscow International]* 41
Finance Minister on 1993 Budget Issues *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
Budget Deficit of Subjects Likely To Be Set Arbitrarily *[INTERFAX]* 42
1992 Budget Deficit May Run to 1.1 Trillion Rubles *[INTERFAX]* 42
Foreign Debts Total 75.8 Billion U.S. Dollars *[ITAR-TASS]* 42
Fedorov Proposes Program To Curtail Inflation *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
Government Amends Price Regulation Decree *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 20 Jan]* 43
Government Prepares Program To Develop Nuclear Energy *[INTERFAX]* 44
Ministry To Promote Nuclear Power Plants *[Moscow TV]* 44
Update on Atomic Energy Plants 11-18 Jan *[INTERFAX]* 45

Military Issues

Yeltsin Issues Order on Missile Technology Exports *[INTERFAX]* 45
Air Defense Forces Assembly Discusses Reforms *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jan]* 45

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk Holds News Conference on Moscow Visit *[Kiev International]* 46

Yukhnovskyy Discusses Division of USSR Debts *[Kiev International]* 54
Parties Issue Statements on Attitudes Toward CIS *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 19 Jan]* 54
Nikolayev Groups Oppose Signing *[Kiev TV]* 54

National Affairs

Supreme Council Meets Amid Socioeconomic Crisis *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Rukh Warns of 'Constitutional Coup' Attempt *[Kiev International]* 55
'Coup' To Restore Communists *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jan]* 55
Prime Minister Kuchma's Politics Assessed *[Radio Rossii]* 55
Vice Premier Views Energy, Fuel Situation *[MOLOD UKRAYINY 12 Jan]* 56
Naval Commander Comments on Building New Fleet *[Moscow TV]* 58
Rally Demands Return of Sevastopol to Russia *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 19 Jan]* 59
Press Center Denies Ostankino Report on Nuclear Dump *[MOLOD UKRAYINY 15 Jan]* 59
Inspectorate Created To Combat Military Corruption *[ITAR-TASS]* 59

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Shushkevich Meeting Achieves 'Full Mutual Understanding' *[INTERFAX]* 60
Shushkevich Gives Qualified Approval to CIS Statutes *[Minsk Radio]* 60
Kebich Says CIS Countries 'Need Each Other' *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
Supreme Soviet Panel Chairman on CIS Minsk Summit *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 20 Jan]* 60
Kebich 'Personally Responsible' for Currency Expenditures *[INTERFAX]* 61
Economic Improvement Becoming 'A Stable Trend' *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 15 Jan]* 61
Government Forms Committee To Regulate Quotas, Licensing *[BELINFORM]* 62
Foreign Ministry Structurally Reorganized *[INTERFAX]* 62

Moldova

Parliament Discusses Snegur's Referendum Proposal *[INTERFAX]* 62
Factions, Opponents Comment *[INTERFAX]* 62
Speaker Criticizes Proposal *[INTERFAX]* 63
'Rupture' Between President, Parliament *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 63
Parliament Rejects Referendum *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 64
Military Cooperation Agreement Signed With Ukraine *[INTERFAX]* 64
'Neighborly Relations' Stressed *[INTERFAX]* 64
Presidential Adviser Anticipating Talks With Tiraspol *[INTERFAX]* 64

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Armenian Delegation Visits; Cooperation Treaties Signed *[Moscow TV]* 65
Nazarbayev Meets Ter-Petrosyan *[Yerevan Radio]* 65
Armenian Delegation Holds Negotiations *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 65
President Addresses Parliament on Russia, Economy *[ITAR-TASS]* 66
Defines Priorities for Developing Economy *[INTERFAX]* 66
Proposes Strengthening 'Supreme Executive Power' *[INTERFAX]* 66
Government Makes Cabinet Changes *[KAZTAG]* 67
Report on Parliamentary Sessions 19 Jan *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 67
Nazarbayev Ready To Sign Documents at CIS Minsk Summit *[INTERFAX]* 67
Nazarbayev Appoints New Press, Media Minister *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 67
More on Signing of Agreements With Tajikistan *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jan]* 68

Kyrgyzstan

Government Says CIS Must Define 'Ideology of Relations' *[INTERFAX]* 68
Akayev Criticizes Government, Stresses Emergency Measures *[INTERFAX]* 68
Akayev Says Constructive Cooperation With CIS 'Impossible' *[INTERFAX]* 69

Tajikistan's Rakhmonov Comments on Border Dispute *[INTERFAX]* 69
Diplomatic Relations Established *[Dushanbe Radio]* 70
President Makes Official Visit to Israel *[INTERFAX]* 70
Economic Cooperation Stressed *[ITAR-TASS]* 70
Discusses Ties, Middle East Issues *[ITAR-TASS]* 71

Tajikistan

Hundreds Receive Military Training in Afghanistan *[INTERFAX]* 71
Islamic Troops Set To Invade *[Dushanbe Radio]* 71
Muslim Head Said To Be Involved in Starting Civil War *[INTERFAX]* 71
'Desperate Situation' of Tajik Refugees in Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jan]* 72
New Defense Minister Appointed *[Dushanbe Radio]* 72
Rakhmonov Satisfied With Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan Visits *[Radio Rossii]* 72

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Favors Consultative Cooperation Within CIS *[ITAR-TASS]* 73

Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan Military Doctrine Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Jan]* 73
Government Suspends Activities of Birlik Opposition Group *[INTERFAX]* 73

Russia's Kremenyuk on Significance of START II Treaty

LD1701191693 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 17 Jan 93

[Interview with Deputy Director of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute Viktor Kremenyuk by correspondent Irina Tkachenko from the "Top Priority" program; interview takes place in Kremenyuk's office; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Tkachenko] Let us go back to the question of the comprehensive partnership between Russia and the United States of America that seems to have been checking out, even though very slowly, in the last couple of years. President-elect Clinton has already voiced support for the START II Treaty and for the mutual efforts of both sides to advance any new initiative in the disarmament area. Would you expect the new administration to add on to this level of cooperation any new areas where Russia and America could finally be striking up a working relationship? And what would the hopes be based on?

[Kremenyuk] Definitely, yes; definitely, yes. Because one of the drawbacks of the position toward Russia which was shared by the Bush Administration was that the administration believed that if Russian-American relations could be limited to the problems of arms control that would be fine, that would be enough for the American security interests and the security interests of the American allies. But now we understand that this was wrong. A stable relationship between Russia and the United States may be achieved only when both sides would be engaged in thousands of different types of relations, both on governmental and nongovernmental level. Only in that case we may be sure that the necessary level of trust would be achieved, that the necessary level of the mutual understanding would be achieved and that the necessary level of some stable relationship would be achieved. Without that there will be always the assumption that Russia is behind the United States, that Russia is losing more than the United States from their relationship and that the United States gains more. And still we have the people and the political groups in this country which believe that this is so.

To avoid this inequality in our relationship we should be oriented toward developing the large, wide scope of the relations, not only in the political area, not only in the nuclear area but also in all other areas of relations. And in this sense the position of the new administration, at least what was said by the president-elect during the campaign and after that, gives evidence that he is closer to this understanding and he and his people, also they understand that to have a stable relationship with Russia in the future the United States will have to work hard.

What has helped to develop American-German and American-Japanese relations from the relations of confrontation which existed pre- and during the Second World War into the relations of close partnership and interdependence? Joint economic development. And the United States has spared a lot of resources to help to these nations to become that developed as they are today and to achieve very high level of the integration between these nations and the United States. [sentence as heard] And now it would be silly even if someone would hint that these nations may become enemies in the future. So without the same type of relations between Russia and America there will always be a threat that somewhere in the future Russia and America may become enemies. To avoid that, there is only one way—to develop a versatile relationship between the two nations and understanding that this will be the United States which will have to sacrifice some, without that, it will be impossible.

[Tkachenko] Viktor Kremenyuk, deputy director of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute. Thank you, sir, very much indeed for finding the time to take part in Top Priority.

[Kremenyuk] Thank you. [passage omitted]

Russian Navy Commander Assesses Start II

OW1901160293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1450 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Admiral Felix Gromov, the commander-in-chief of the Russian Navy, declared that the Russian-American START-2 Treaty signed in Moscow on January 3 "foresees radical changes in the ratio of forces within the nuclear triads of Russia and the United States."

During his conversation with journalists in Moscow, the naval commander reported, in particular, that the START-2 Treaty states the authorized number of warheads on nuclear submarines, namely, 2160 units in 7 years (by 2000) and 1750 in 10 years (by 2003). The admiral pointed out that the reduction will be an unequal one, the United States are to cut down the number of nuclear warheads on its submarines approximately by 3.3 times and Russia only by 1.6-1.7 times.

According to Gromov, following the realization of the START-2 Treaty, the number of the warheads in the Russian land nuclear forces and the Navy will be "almost equal" by 2000. As a result "a structural nearing with the American forces will occur in which, as it is known, the Naval forces are the main carriers of nuclear weapons," said the admiral. Gromov believes that this is a positive feature because, as he said, "submarines are less vulnerable in case of any local conflicts or crises."

Gromov noted that due to the structural changes of the Russian nuclear forces, Russia should substantially increase the responsibility of the nuclear fleet's personnel for safety of the rockets and the nuclear reactors." [no open quotation marks as received]

Ukraine's CNDF Resists Start I Ratification

OW1501200493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1938 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ukraine should not eliminate her nuclear weapons unless other nuclear powers do so, too, said Mikhail Goryn, Chairman of the Congress of National Democratic Forces (CNDF) and of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), in a Ukrainian radio address on Friday [15 January].

He thought that the Western countries were pressing the Ukraine for speedy ratification of START-1. Goryn said that "the West failed to appreciate the Ukraine's noble gesture of eliminating her tactical nuclear capability... I believed that the world would worship this country on its knees but what we have is a pistol at our forehead and demands that we eliminate our nuclear arsenal at a faster rate", he said.

Nikolay Porovskiy, his CNDF parliamentary deputy, argued that nuclear weapons deployed on Ukrainian soil ensured peace there. "The US will not allow any warfare in any country where missiles are targeted at NATO countries. Once these missiles are out, the Ukraine will enter the sphere of Russia's strategic interests and armed conflicts such as those in the Caucasus or Central Asia can be started", said he.

Moving missiles into Russia would be "like Kuwait surrendering her weapons to Iraq and becoming an Iraqi protectorate." He believed that Russia would use more sophisticated missiles that are deployed in the Ukraine in order to replace her obsolete systems and this was bound to step up nuclear confrontation; if chauvinists seize power in Russia, these missiles will be trained at Ukrainian targets.

U.S. Concerns Over Ukraine and START Viewed

PM1501150193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jan 93 p 6

[Vladislav Drobkov "View from Washington": "When the Fanfares Sounded"]

[Text] Washington—As time goes by, the euphoria surrounding the Strategic Offensive Weapons Treaty [START] II, hastily signed in Moscow, has started to gradually die down. The true outlines of what has been accomplished have started to show. At the same time, it is becoming obvious that the agreement with the United States will not bring the promised positive effect to Russia and its interests, ranging from defense interests to economic interests. The agreement itself may turn out to be simply a scrap of paper if the conflict of interests that has emerged over the nuclear missiles located on the territory of another "interested party"—Ukraine—is not resolved.

According to American figures, there are now 1,656 nuclear warheads in Ukraine, located on 176 intercontinental missiles and 30 strategic bombers. Kiev is making it increasingly obvious that it is not averse to making its own independent arrangements for the rich nuclear legacy from the Union. This kind of stance has now seriously alarmed Washington.

Why has the stance of Ukraine and its president and parliament suddenly caused Washington such worry? The point is that if the conditions of the START I Treaty, which was concluded by Bush and Gorbachev, are not fulfilled, then it will be impossible to begin the implementation of the significantly more radical START II Treaty. Following the collapse of the USSR, it was stipulated that START I had to be ratified by the parliaments of all four "nuclear successors to the Soviet Union"—Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus. So far only Moscow and Alma-Ata have fulfilled this agreement. Kiev and Minsk, which have expressed their support for the treaty in words, are in fact not hastening to give it the parliamentary "go-ahead."

At the same time, the campaign in support of Ukraine keeping its own nuclear potential indefinitely is spreading in Ukraine. Incidentally, THE NEW YORK TIMES also cites a statement made by Major General Vladimir Tolubko, commander of the strategic forces, who stated in the Ukrainian parliament: "As a military man, I am sure that without nuclear weapons the defense of a state cannot be sufficiently effective or generate confidence."

It is not surprising that certain people in Washington made haste to accuse Ukraine of "nuclear blackmail." U.S. Secretary of State L. Eagleburger publicly called on Kiev to hurry up with the ratification of START I and confirm in practice the promises that Kravchuk made to Bush during the Ukrainian president's visit to Washington in May last year. But more often, official Washington prefers to influence Kiev anonymously.

"Leaks" like this gushed particularly violently from "reliable sources" during the recent visit to the United States by a Ukrainian military-political delegation headed by Deputy Foreign Minister B. Tarasyuk. But despite the clearly resolute or else threatening tone of the "leaks," the official tone of the talks was of a markedly friendly nature.

For example, at a 7 January State Department briefing it was amusing to watch its representative R. Boucher recoil from journalists' direct questions about Kiev's demands and Washington's reactions to them. According to him, the Ukrainian delegation did not put forward any new conditions in connection with the ratification of the START I Treaty, nor did it demand any additional guarantees or economic assistance.

But at the same time Boucher reported that U.S. economic assistance in eliminating Ukrainian nuclear missiles remains within the previous framework of $175 million this year. Remember, the Ukrainian president

called this sum a "drop in the ocean," which does not cover the real expenditure involved in the dismantling of the weapons being reduced at all. According to him, around 1,200 million is needed.

According to the American press, on his return to Kiev, Tarasyuk stated that he had persuaded Washington to agree to grant formal guarantees of Ukraine's security. Although Washington rejects the possibility of concluding any kind of agreement involving American commitments to ensure the security of a nuclear-free Ukraine.

Nevertheless the current Ukrainian visit to Washington was an extraordinary event. In obvious violation of protocol, President Bush himself met with Deputy Minister Tarasyuk. It cannot be ruled out that Washington has started to play the "Ukrainian card" in the big political game with Russia and other former Soviet republics. Such calls have already been heard for a long time.

The idea of observer S. Talbott, famous here, in whose opinion Kiev may want to keep its nuclear weapons as a lever of pressure on... Moscow, demonstrates the possible extent of Kiev's contraposition to Moscow, which certain political scientists in Washington are discussing. Nothing is stopping Ukraine from obtaining the technical possibility of retargeting its missiles from the West to the East in the future, he stated. Furthermore, in interviews with American journalists, Ukrainian politicians and military figures do not deny that they have the capability of retargeting their missiles. Thus, none other than Kravchuk himself told a NEW YORK TIMES correspondent that SS-24 missiles were assembled in Ukraine and could be used by Ukraine...

To give many of the American scientists their due, it must be said that they have a good understanding here of the potential threat connected with attempts to encourage "nuclear nationalism." As Professor T. Nichols of Dartmouth College wrote in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, "the Ukrainian policy is irresponsible and dangerous. It threatens stability in Europe..."

Whatever Washington may say about Kiev's policy, the Ukrainians' obstinacy has had certain results. The White House was forced to show pronounced attention to the envoys from Kiev. Despite its statements, the United States may ultimately raise the "premium" for the ratification of the START I Treaty by the Ukrainian parliament. And finally, they are starting to understand here that good relations with Moscow alone are not enough when it comes to questions of strategic arms reduction.

Time will tell in what direction this reinterpretation will move next—establishing mutually advantageous relations or attempting to use the "Ukrainian card" in order to put pressure on Moscow. At the moment, however, we can note that having decided not to make haste in questions of nuclear disarmament, Ukraine will clearly win political and economic advantages in comparison with Russia, whose president gave too generous a gift to his personal "friend George" who is leaving the political arena.

Stop the Press...

Ukrainian Deputy Foreign Minister B. Tarasyuk has stated the following in an interview with the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR: "The United States has given Ukraine written security guarantees, which facilitate the ratification by the Ukrainian Parliament of the START I Treaty. The United States has finally seen our stance and understood our concerns and fears about a potential threat from Russia." (ITAR-TASS 13 January)

Russia Begins Talks With U.S. on Missile Technology

OW1501174993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1707 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia and the USA have begun to formulate a bi-lateral memorandum to resolve disputes over the export of missile technology. It will also establish control over the proliferation of missile technology. Diplomatic Panorama was informed by Sergey Chubakhin, leader of the Russian delegation at talks with the USA this week. The American delegation was headed by Robert Einhorn, the deputy assistant to the US Secretary of State.

Chubakhin pointed out that despite the generally constructive mood of the talks, the Americans had attempted to bring provisions into the memorandum to place Russian enterprises' business contacts abroad under the control of US internal legislation. This, he said, would further complicate Russia's joining the world space services market. Meanwhile, Russia possessed good facilities for rocket carriers and could receive large hard currency amounts for launching foreign satellites.

The diplomat said that the US delegation had insisted that the Russian side agree on a list of states to which Russian missile technology could be exported. The list included traditional partners such as China, Brazil, Egypt, India and others.

One of the main subjects of the talks was economic sanctions on the Russian Space Command for the famous "India transaction" (the contract to supply boosters to launch satellites was considered by the Americans to fall within the regulations for the control over missile technology and all forms of contact between American companies and the Russian Space Command were forbidden in May last year). Chubakhin said that the Russian side had not made any headway with the Americans here, although supplementary information

proving that the contract with India did not violate the above regulations was presented.

He said that the Americans were currently considering imposing sanctions on other Russian enterprises party to the transaction with India besides the Space Command. These included the "Salyut" design office, where the "Proton" rocket carriers are made. This placed the joint project to launch of the American INMARSAT public satellite under threat, as "Proton" carriers were to be used. The agreement on this was reached during the meeting between president's Boris Yeltsin and George Bush in June, 1992.

The head of the Russian delegation said that the Americans intended to consider the Russian arguments thoroughly and submit their proposals in time for the next meeting, the date of which will be decided after Bill Clinton's administration commences.

Russia's Glukhikh on Arms Exports, Conversion, Defense

LD1501205493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1442 GMT 15 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—"Russia does not plan to leave the world arms market. If a country has normal armaments it can sell them," head of the Russian committee on defence plants and industry Viktor Glukhikh told a news conference here today.

He considers abnormal Russia's recent yielding of positions in the area. In 1989 the former Soviet Union was the leader of the world arms market and its share amounted to 38.7 per cent. Now the index has lowered to 17 per cent, and the United States increased its share of arms exports over the same period from 30 per cent in 1989 to 56 per cent in 1992.

Last year Russia received about four billion U.S. dollars from arms sales, at the same time, it lost over seven billion dollars due to the loss of its traditional sales markets, including those in Eastern Europe.

Main Russian clients for arms and equipment delivery are China and India. In future the number of clients is expected to expand. In February, 1993, Russia plans to participate in a large international arms exhibition in the United Arab Emirates to put on display rocket launchers, planes, helicopters, tanks, APCs and fire arms previously kept secret.

Describing the potential of Russian defence plants, Glukhikh said they include over 1,700 ventures to employ about six million people. The plants are making over 80 per cent from the overall amount of civil products, including 100 per cent of tv sets and bicycles and 80 per cent of refrigerators.

The most painful moment of Russian conversion is that major principles of military building have not been finally established, and military orders have been sharply reduced. In comparison with 1990, 1991 witnessed the lowering of orders for military products by 32 per cent. In 1992 the index lowered by another 68 per cent as against 1991.

As for this year's order, the enterprises have been informed only on planned figures, since the Russian parliament has not approved the budget. The United States, in its turn, converse [as received] from three to five per cent of military production a year.

A reason for the grave situation in the defence industry is the breaking of economic relations with defence plants of the former Soviet Union. The relations are now being restored, said Glukhikh. A group of committee staffers has recently visited Ukraine to reach an essential agreement on interaction in the area of civil aircraft building and production of helicopters, motor-making and some new developments.

Similar contacts are being established with other CIS states. Mutual payments are the most complicated issue of these relations, he said.

Conversion is a costly thing, and all countries treat it with caution. In 1993 Russian conversion will require 500 billion roubles. The committee chairman believes state credits allocated for conversion must not be taxed.

Heads of States and Governments Gather in Minsk

Summary of Main Documents

OW1901182893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1805 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Presidential Bulletin offers summaries of main documents that the Working Group of the Council of Heads of States and the Council of Heads of Governments has drafted for the Minsk summit of Commonwealth leaders scheduled for January 22. The tentative agenda of the heads of states includes 12 points and is expected to be finalized by the CIS foreign ministers who will meet on January 20.

1. Declaration on International Commitments on Human Rights and Basic Freedoms. The CIS member nations will undertake to honor commitments in the field of human rights that were made by the USSR in the framework of international agreements and treaties. The undertaking is declared to work out and conclude shortly a CIS Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights which must be the first step towards the signing of a Commonwealth-wide Convention on Protection of Human Rights.

2. Agreement on the Setting up of an Interstate Bank (IB) and a Payment Mechanism in the Ruble Zone. The IB will clear multilateral payments between the national banks in trading and other transactions and coordinate the activities of monetary and crediting systems of the parties to the Agreement. Every country will be represented by one member on the IB Board, each country having one vote whatever her contribution to the IB capital. The IB transactions will be in rubles. The IB Board will decide whether clearing payments will be made in rubles or in hard currency. The summit will decide whether the IB will be headquartered in Moscow or Minsk.

3. Regulation on the Council of CIS Defense Ministers (submitted by the Council). The Council, chaired by the Commander-in-Chief of Joint Armed Forces (JAF), will coordinate the activities of defense agencies in the CIS and submit to the Council of Heads of States proposals on the setting up, composition, organic structure, and doctrine of the JAF and on the CIS nuclear policy.

4. Agreement on Amending the Agreement on Strategic Forces (submitted by the JAF Commander-in-Chief). The Strategic Forces will include "military units and installations which are armed with or store strategic nuclear weapons and also their support units. The list of military units and installations to be included in the Strategic Forces will be determined by every State. The JAF Commander-in-Chief and the Defense Minister of the CIS State will issue an appropriate joint order".

5. Convention on Legal Assistance and Legal Relations in Civil, Family, and Criminal Cases. Citizens of every CIS State will enjoy in other CIS States the same legal protection they do in their own State.

6. Agreement on Regulation of the Interstate Securities Market. The parties to this agreement acknowledge the need to make their securities markets available to the issuing and investing institutions of other States.

This Agreement will cover the debts of state authorities and management bodies (state securities), shares, and bonds of businesses.

The Parties will agree to provide equal opportunities for the shares and bonds issued by businesses within their boundaries.

The Agreement will not cover securities issued by state bodies and businesses which come under the jurisdiction of states which are not signatories of the Agreement.

7. The draft CIS Charter which was worked out back in December will hardly be on the Minsk agenda, Russian diplomatic sources believe, above all because Ukraine is unwilling to sign it. The experts feel, however, that in lieu of the Charter the CIS leaders will be invited to discuss a draft joint statement (declaration) which will essentially be a letter of intent confirming adherence to the Belovezhskaya Agreements.

It would be enlightening to recall that the latest Draft Charter envisages a three-tier formula of sharing in the Commonwealth. States which will have signed and ratified the Agreement on the Setting up of CIS of December 8, 1991 (the Belovezhskaya Agreement) and its Protocol of December 21, 1991 (the Alma-Ata Protocol) by the time of adopting the Charter will be full CIS members. An "associated membership" formula will be available for states "wishing to join in specific CIS activities on conditions specified in an Agreement on Associated Membership". The Council of Heads of Governments will be empowered to offer the observer status to countries wishing to attend sessions of Commonwealth bodies.

8. Regulation on an Advisory Economic Working Commission under the Council of Heads of States and the Council of Heads of Governments. Every CIS member state will be represented in the Commission by a Government Minister. It will work out proposals on coordination of national economic and foreign trade activities. Tajikistan's representatives think that the Commission must also be empowered to submit to the CIS Economic Court proposals on sanctions for failure to honor commitments. Ukraine has voiced dissent. Kiev suspects that the draft would make the Commission a supranational body, which is in conflict with Ukrainian law and so the draft will never be ratified by the Ukrainian Parliament.

9. The time and venue of the next Council of Heads of States session.

10. Kazakhstan wants the Council of Heads of States to discuss also steps to stabilize the situation on the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border.

11. The setting up of and guidelines for an Interstate Court of the CIS.

12. Miscellaneous (notably the Tajikistan situation).

Foreign Ministers Begin Meeting

LD2001103393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0958 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Minsk, 20 Jan (ITAR-TASS)— A meeting of foreign ministers and permanent representatives of the CIS member states in the Working Group of the Council of Heads of States and the Council of Heads of Commonwealth Governments opened in the Belorussian capital today. Leaders of foreign policy departments and permanent representatives of CIS member states confirmed the final draft agenda for the summit meeting which is to begin 22 January in Minsk. They will consider more than 10 points of the agenda of the Council of Heads of States and about as many points of the agenda of the Council of Heads of Governments.

Kozyrev, Kravchenko Comment

LD2001155793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1538 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Minsk January 20 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin will arrive to attend the CIS summit in Minsk with "a solid baggage of principled ideas and proposals to strengthen the Commonwealth," according to Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev.

"Maybe this would be a CIS doctine," he told reporters on Wednesday after a meeting of CIS foreign ministers in Minsk.

The ministers have agreed on 24 issues to be submitted for the summit due to take place on January 22 and worked out the agenda for it.

The issue of the interstate bank was omitted from the agenda as it demands additional expertise, according to Kozyrev.

The situation in Tajikistan was included in the agenda which is, however, dominated by the adoption of the CIS charter.

Ukraine and Turkmenistan refuse to join it and the foreign ministers of the two countries confirmed it during a press conference. The Turkmen representative said his country prefers bilateral agreements in developing relations with the Commonwealth states.

But Belarusian Foreign Minister Petr Kravchenko said that the charter envisages "flexible integration" of CIS states and takes into account all opinions. The adopted formula does not exclude that other states of the region would join the charter, he said evidently referring to Ukraine, Turkmenistan and other former Soviet republics.

Kravchenko believes the charter will be approved at the summit, but Kozyrev said there would be a serious discussion of it as foreign ministers have disagreed on its human rights article.

Apart from the charter the ministers also discussed changes to the agreement on strategic forces, the declaration on interstate obligations in human rights, the creation of an interstate TV and radio company.

Strategic Forces To Be Discussed

LD2001185293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1620 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Minsk January 20 TASS—The CIS summit in Minsk is expected to strictly determine the composition of strategic forces of the Commonwealth so that to avoid any misunderstanding between the interested parties, according to Leonid Ivashov, secretary of the Council of Defence Ministers of the Commonwealth.

He explained that earlier the composition of strategic forces was rather vaguely defined and included units of practically all arms of the armed forces, excluding ground troops.

This caused difficulties for CIS states in determining the concrete and acceptable list of units to be transferred to the strategic force, he told TASS on Wednesday.

The CIS Main Command now agreed with most national Defence Ministries that the strategic forces will include units and objects possessing and storing strategic nuclear weapons and units servicing them, he explained.

This concerns strategic nuclear missile, naval and air forces, certain anti-aircraft units, reconnaissance and technical services, according to Ivashov.

Each CIS state will independently determine the list of strategic units deployed on its territory and sign it with the CIS commander-in-chief, he added.

Ivashov does not believe that the new procedure will eliminate all differences among members of the CIS "Nuclear Club", but said it would open better possibilities for their solution at bilateral talks.

"Apart from Russia, no other nuclear CIS state can provide proper safety and technical maintenance for nuclear warheads," he stressed, adding that this forced Ukraine to accept Russian nuclear safety guarantees.

The joint decision of the Russian and Ukrainian president on strategic forces may serve as an example of eliminating contradictions among other CIS nuclear states, Ivashov believes.

The CIS summit in Minsk is also expected to consider provisions for the Council of CIS Defence Ministers, discuss measures to stabilise the situation on the Tajik-Afghan border.

Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev suggested to include the issue of the CIS unified armed forces into the agenda and commander-in-chief Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov has already prepared his address to the summit, Ivashov disclosed.

"We hope that heads of state will at least adopt a protocol decision which would oblige heads of government and the Council of Defence Ministers to pay more attention to the defence of the Commonwealth. We have lost a lot in the sphere and we have found little new," he stressed.

The Council of Defence Ministers will meet in Minsk on Thursday to discuss the duties of deputies of the CIS commander-in-chief, social and legal guarantees of military observers and peace-keepers, as well as the plan of the council's work in 1993. "No sensations are expected," according to Ivashov.

Ukraine, Turkmenistan Oppose Charter

LD2001192093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By correspondent L. Sviridov in Minsk; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A session of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the CIS was held in Minsk this afternoon. The ministers agreed on the agenda of the summit meeting which opens on 22 January. Russia, Belarus, Turkmenistan, and Tajikistan were represented by their foreign ministers, Armenia by its acting minister, and Ukraine by its first deputy minister. It was agreed at the conference that 12 questions be put forward for the agenda of the Minsk meeting.

At a news conference later, Belarus Minister Petr Kravchenko said that on 22 January information will also be heard from the Tajik leadership on the state of affairs in that region. As far as the CIS charter is concerned, it will first be initialled by the premiers and then presented for signing to the presidents of the CIS countries. Ukraine and Turkmenistan are opposed to such a document.

It was revealed at the news conference that some delegations also oppose the existence of the CIS coordinating bodies in their present form. Belarus Minister Petr Kravchenko still believes that Minsk could easily become for the CIS what Brussels has become for West Europe.

A session of the defense ministers of the CIS countries and the Nuclear Planning Committee will be held in Minsk on 21 January.

Defense Ministers' Meeting Noted

LD2001223693 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 20 Jan 93

[From the "News and Views" program]

[Text] On Thursday [21 January], the eve of the CIS summit conference, the Council of Defense Ministers will meet in session to discuss a number of urgent problems, in the first place the combat readiness of national armies, the position of career servicemen, and the future of nuclear arms of the former USSR. Radio Moscow's reporter Aleksandr Yakovlev has asked the Secretary of the CIS Defense Ministers Council, Lt. General Leonid Ivashov, for details and this is what he said:

The politicians have managed to separate the manpower and hardware of the former USSR. In this situation, the Chief Command and the CIS Defense Ministers Council have been doing everything they can to maintain in appropriate condition what has been left and to help coordinate the efforts to establish national armies. So far the combat readiness of the armies of independent countries in the territory of the former USSR is rather doubtful. A standard, well oiled machinery of Army control has been ruined. Research into new types of military hardware, the material supply of the ground forces and the navy, manning policies, everything has been frustrated. In some cases there have been tense relations between former Soviet republics and they pose the risk of involving armies in confrontation.

General Ivashov said the grave position of many career Army officers, in particular Russians, is another source of tension. Tens of thousands have been dismissed from the Army or returned to Russia from other former Soviet republics. Those problems have been discussed with CIS heads of state more than once. A number of well worded agreements have been signed. Yet in most cases they have failed to be observed.

When they meet in Minsk, CIS Defense Ministers will focus on the problem of nuclear arms of the former Soviet Union in connection with the Russian-U.S. START II Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty. One can say in advance, General Ivashov remarks, that the CIS defense ministers will find a common language. Now it is up to the politicians to narrow their differences. The main question they are expected to give an answer to is what states should have nuclear arms.

Belarus Defense Minister Comments

LD2101100293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0923 GMT 21 Jan 93

[By BELINFORM-TASS correspondent Leonid Tratsetskiy]

[Text] Minsk January 21 TASS—Everything is ready for the meeting of the CIS Defence Ministers Council here. It is to open today at the Minsk Central Officers Club.

The ministers plan to discuss several questions, including a plan for the work of the CIS Defence Ministers Council in 1993, steps to improve the procedure of awarding veterans of the great partriotic war and soldiers-internalionalists, and preparations for the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War, etc.

Belarus Defence Minister Colonel-General Pavel Kozlovskiy told BELINFORM the day before the meeting that he hoped its results would be positive. The minister believes his counterparts will find ways for the approximation of their positions. He is also convinced that the development and formation of armed forces in CIS countries largely depended on the solution of economic problems within the Commonwealth.

Defense Ministers' Agenda Given

LD2101113793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0951 GMT 21 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Mineyev and Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Minsk, 21 Jan—Poor flying weather in Minsk has caused a three-hour delay in the meeting of the CIS Defense Ministers Council which was scheduled for 1100 [0800 GMT]. Some military delegations have failed to arrive and the aircraft of Aviation Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, has been held up.

The agenda of today's meeting includes a number of issues of a working nature. The heads of military delegations are proposing to discuss measures to fulfil the decision of the Interparliamentary Assembly, held in St. Petersburg in December, "On the Implementation of the Accords and the Elaboration of Recommendatory Documents on Defense Matters," and also the issues "On the Functional Duties of the Deputies of the Commander in Chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces," "On the Social and Legal Guarantees of the Personnel of Military Observer Groups and Collective Peacekeping Forces Within the CIS," and "On the Numbers of Personnel of Working Groups Attached to Representatives of the Armed Forces of the CIS States in the Main Command." It is proposed to adopt a work plan for the Defense Ministers Council for 1993 and to decide a number of matters of a financial and organizational nature.

The majority of empowered delegations who will take part in tomorrow's CIS summit meeting are expected to arrive in Minsk today. The delegation of Azerbaijan arrived last night. The presidents of Russia and Ukraine will arrive in Minsk on 22 January.

Yeltsin To Present Proposals

OW2101011793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1717 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Andrey Kozyrev, told Interfax on Wednesday in Minsk that President Boris Yeltsin will arrive on 22 January for the CIS summit in the Belarusian capital with a package of concrete proposals aimed at strengthening the Commonwealth. The head of the foreign policy department declined to specify what concrete initiatives he was talking about. He only noted that the proposal with which the president is coming to Minsk may be characterized as the "doctrine of the CIS."

Kozyrev said that 20 January at the morning session of the joint meeting of ministers of foreign affairs of the CIS and the working group of the Commonwealth there was basically an agreement on the agenda of the forthcoming summit. Only one question was excised from it - on inter-state court - in view of the inadequate preparation of the text of the proposed agreement. According to the minister, before the summit experts will specify the details of two military agreements - on the council of ministers of defense of the CIS and on changes in the position of the strategic forces of the Commonwealth, and also they will complete work on the declaration of international obligations on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Well informed diplomatic sources told Interfax correspondent that at the meeting in Minsk on Wednesday the representatives of Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan once more raised the question of the expediency of adopting a declaration on international obligations on human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In an interview with Interfax the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation assessed as especially important that in the agenda of the summit of leaders of the CIS be included the "complex questions related to the situation in Tajikistan." In relation to this he noted that "the CIS is becoming more active and is not declining from considering those crisis situations which exist within the Commonwealth."

Answering a question by the Interfax correspondent on whether or not the minister was disappointed in the fact that many republics sent to Minsk not ministers of foreign affairs but deputies or proxies, Andrey Kozyrev expressed the opinion that this can be explained by "purely technical" reasons. At the same time he noted that only once did he miss such a meeting himself. "It is necessary to sustain the level of participation", noted the Russian minister. According to him the fact that a number of ministers did not find it possible to come" is most likely related to the problems of development than politics."

Nuclear Policy Committee To Meet

LD2101125393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1216 GMT 21 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Minsk January 21 TASS—The CIS Nuclear Policy Committee will meet today in the Belarusian capital within the framework of the session of the Commonwealth Council of Defence Ministers.

The heads of the military departments of the four CIS nuclear powers (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan), as well as Commander-in-Chief of the Commonwealth Joint Armed Forces Air Marshall Yevgeniy Shapashnikov are members of the committee. The other CIS states are observers.

Journalists do not have access to the agenda for the meeting, but ITAR-TASS has heard from reliable sources that it includes questions about guarantees of control over the strategic nuclear forces.

The heads of military departments, in addition to considering the above-mentioned items on the agenda at the session of the Council of Defence Ministers, will look at a series of documents submitted for discussion by the Councils of CIS Heads of State and Government.

Shaposhnikov on CIS Economic, Military Union

LD1901163893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1605 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—Eight CIS states may voluntarily join in an economic and military union which will have a certain coordinating structures, according to CIS Commander-in-Chief Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov.

Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Armenia are ready to make the step, while Belarus and Turkmenistan may agree on certain conditions, he told reporters on Tuesday.

If the union is formed, the CIS main military command will be a coordinating body which is to control general-purpose and strategic forces until the latter are eliminated in Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine. After that Russia and those wishing may conclude an agreement on a common "nuclear umbrella," he said.

Shaposhnikov added that he still believes in the CIS collective security treaty. His main command is in contact with those parliaments which have not ratified it and "we are ready for softer forms of settling the problem," he said explaining that ratification credentials can be exchanged among parliaments with certain amendments.

"I have not lost hope that the collective security treaty will remain after the Minsk summit" on January 22, Shaposhnikov said.

However, he acknowledged that the treaty is practically not functioning, it has not been definitely determined to who the former Soviet nuclear strategic forces belong, CIS states do not coordinate efforts in providing social welfare benefits for the military and some of them want to create their own defence by themselves.

But there are stabilising factors in the Commonwealth as well, according to Shaposhnikov. Among them he listed the striving of many states to closer cooperation in economy and defence, the adoption of laws on defence issues, the determination of which state inherits the former Soviet general-purpose forces, unanimous opinion about tactical nuclear weapons, the implementation of the treaty on conventional arms in Europe, etc.

Two Forms of Unity Possible

LD1901233693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1608 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Remarks by Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, CIS Armed Forces commander in chief, at a news conference with unidentified correspondents in Moscow on 19 January—recorded]

[Text] The Commonwealth can take on two forms.

The Commonwealth currently is an amorphous entity. There are no coordinating bodies. If there are any, they are only nominal and have no influence on solutions to the cardinal issues of interaction and cooperation. The activity of coordinating bodies does not extend beyond preparing conferences and meetings. I would say that this is the most difficult path. Its difficult nature could be partly offset by bilateral agreements, but it will hardly be possible to avoid it altogether, at least for the next few years. If this option is taken, the high command of the CIS Joint Armed Forces can turn into the high command of the strategic nuclear forces until these forces are completely eliminated on the territory of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. If the states agree to hand over the functions of command of strategic nuclear forces to Russia, the high command could be abolished altogether and the system of collective defense and security thereby renounced.

I feel the second path of development meets the interests of the peoples of the CIS and the whole world the best. With this option, the Commonwealth represents a close economic and military-political union with strong coordinating bodies invested with certain rights. It should be formed by those states that strive toward close and comprehensive cooperation in accordance with the principle that says: from self-determination to integration. Self-determination has already taken place. The whole world is engaged in integration. Europe is an example. We went through integration, followed by self-determination, and now perhaps we should undergo

integration on some new basis for the good of our peoples. We feel that Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Armenia, and—given certain conditions—Belarus and Turkmenistan are ready to accept this option. Naturally, they are [word indistinct] formed and function on the principles of equality, democracy, and civilized partnership without detriment to political sovereignty or the revival of the rigid ambitious and numerous central structures that existed in the past. If this option is taken, the high command, as the Commonwealth's coordinating body on the issues of defense and security, will carry out the operational management of:

(a) The general purpose forces of collective security members, which can assign to the joint armed forces agreed military contingents to carry out peacemaking and other functions, and;

(b) The CIS strategic forces until they are completely eliminated on the territory of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. An agreement on a common nuclear umbrella could be concluded between Russia and the favorably inclined Commonwealth members in the future.

'Contradictions' With Ukraine Solvable

OW1901155693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1449 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Marshal of Aviation and the Commander-in-Chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, believes that contradictions on the issue concerning strategic nuclear armaments between Russia and Ukraine can be liquidated within the next month. He said that the parties plan to develop an appropriate bilateral agreement before that time.

Addressing a briefing on Tuesday in Moscow, Shaposhnikov pointed out that the contradictions on this problem primarily concern three positions:

- guarantees to ensure Ukraine's security following its loss of nuclear status. It has already received such guarantees from Great Britain and the United States, while Russia presented these guarantees in the course of the last meeting of Yeltsin and Kravchuk;

- Ukraine demands material compensation from Russia "for nuclear property" stationed on its territory:

- Russia, in its turn, is dissatisfied with its legal responsibility for the nuclear weapons stationed on the Ukrainian territory, while actually not having the opportunity to control their safety and security. Moscow demands the legal state of the nuclear weapons be clearly determined.

According to Shaposhnikov, during their meeting in Moscow on January 15, Presidents Yeltsin and Kravchuk "have found the key to solving these problems."

'Unrepresented' Groups To Meet in The Hague

OW1901182993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1720 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboinikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Spokesmen for a number of ethnic territories in the Russian Federation intend to take part in a general assembly of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO) which opens in the Hague, Netherlands, on Tuesday [19 January].

The five-day assembly is to be addressed by President Dzhokar Dudayev of Chechnya, by Vice-President Vasiliy Likhachev of Tatarstan and by the Deputy Chairman of the Parliament of the Sakha Republic (Yakutia), Vasiliy Vlasov.

Only a few of the nations and peoples belonging to the former Soviet Union have joined the UNPO: the Crimean Tatars, Abkhazia, Chechnya, Mari-El and Tatarstan. It is believed that, at the Hague assembly, the UNPO will be joined by Chuvashia. Its potential members include the Buryats, Komis, Kumyks (an ethnic group living in the North Caucasus), Meskhetian Turks, South and North Ossets, Udmurts, Yakuts and members of Inkerin Liitto, an organization of ethnic Finns living in Ingermanland (part of Leningrad Region).

As DP's [Diplomatic Panorama's] correspondent learned from the Russian Foreign Ministry, the UNPO was established in February, 1991. It functions as a nongovernmental organization, abiding by the laws of the country it is registered in. Its members are nations and peoples, which believe that they are "inadequately" represented in such organizations, as the U.N.

The UNPO has no official status at the U.N., and the Russian Foreign Ministry maintains no official contacts with it. Therefore the Russian citizens, who intend to join the conference in the Hague, will travel as private citizens.

In an unofficial interview Russian Foreign Ministry officials have conceded that the goal proclaimed by the UNPO: support for its members engaged in a nonviolent struggle for cultural autonomy, self-determination or independence, makes the authorities of many countries wary, since it is conducive to a rise in separatist trends. "This concerns Russia's national interests too," said a Russian diplomat.

The UNPO was formed at a time, when an active international campaign for enabling the three Baltic states (former Soviet republics) to be admitted to the U.N. was in progress. Now the situation is different (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia have become U.N. members), and, according to Russian diplomats, the separatist inclinations of the leaders of some ethnic minorities in the Russian Federation are unlikely to be

supported by the Western governments, some of which have to cope with complicated problems of similar nature.

One of the Russian diplomats indulged in gloomy fantasies. The break-up of the USSR, he said, led to the emergence of four countries possessing nuclear arms, which entailed a vast number of serious problems. "Just fancy what will happen, if all members of the Russian Federation begin to demand sovereignty and their own share of nuclear weaponry!"

Black Sea Fleet Commander Urges Upholding Agreements

LD2001024093 Kiev Ukrayinske Telebachennya Network in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin, recently appointed to the post of Black Sea Fleet commander by agreement of the Russian and Ukrainian sides, believes the only guarantee of the survival of society is in clearly keeping to laws and government agreements. He stated that there is little water in the Black Sea, but a lot of politics. His task is to not allow confrontation at a local level. The vice admiral is convinced that any kind of confrontation into which military leaders are drawn ends in military conflict.

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 20 Jan

LD2001094593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0605 GMT 20 Jan 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 20 ITAR-TASS—Commenting on the press conference of Russian Deputy Prime Minister Boris Fyodorov, that was held on Monday night [18 January], NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA comes to the conclusion that he, "the same as the government in general, is confidently following the path of the reform." However, "one can hardly expect that there will be no losses and mistakes on this way."

Fyodorov said that interest on the deposits of individuals in the savings banks would be at least doubled soon. People will preserve the money, needed for privatization, while enterprises, attracted by more advantageous terms than those offered by commercial banks, will become clients of the savings bank, the newspaper believes. It expresses apprehension that the too hasty reforming of the bank may fully depreciate the depositors' money.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an article about the CIS summit that opens in Minsk on Friday. According to the newspapers, the intensification of Russian-Ukrainian arguments on the eve of CIS summits has become a tradition. "Take, for example, the payment, demanded by Kiev for the plutonium and uranium which are to be extracted from 'Ukrainian' warheads. But it is not the division of profits that triggered the controversy. The essence of the problem is that we are just beginning to develop the technologies which will make it possible in the future to use plutonium and uranium, extracted from weapons, for peaceful purposes. Meanwhile the most acute problem is what is to be done with the radioactive waste? How much money will be needed for building reliable storage facilities? Thus, it would be more logical if Moscow demanded payment from Ukraine for the long-term storage of 'Ukrainian' radioactive materials," the newspaper's observer Aleksandr Golts believes.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA carries an interview with Aleksandr Kotenkov, head of the provisional administration on the territory of North Ossetia and Ingushetia, under the headline "Disintegration of Russian State Must Be Stopped." In his opinion, the most difficult task facing the provisional administration is the finding of the way to settle the conflict between the two republics, both of which are integrated in the Russian Federation.

Refugees continue to be the most serious problem of the region. "Large-scale talks" between representatives of the two nations are needed for starting the process of permanent settlement of people affected by the conflict, Kotenkov believes. Russia should take part in them by all means. "When starting the talks, one should take into account that any solution will satisfy the parties concerned no more than by 50 per cent. I personally drew up 12 ways of resolving the problem, and I believe some of them are acceptable for both sides," Kotenkov said.

Analysing the situation in Tajikistan, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes that it resembles the situation that existed there in the 20s. At that time "some 200,000 Tajik peasants (according to Soviet sources) and some 900,000 (according to the estimates of Western specialists) fled to Afghanistan, trying to escape from repressions of the Red Army."

According to the press centre of the Russian frontier guard troops deployed in Tajikistan, some 50,000 Tajik citizens are now staying in Afghanistan. The newspaper believes the exodus is not yet over, and emigration to Afghanistan will continue.

According to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, a hotline will connect the defence ministries of Belarus and the United States. An agreement about it was signed in Minsk by Aleksandr Tushinskiy, Belarusian first deputy minister of defence, and John Berkley, U.S. first deputy secretary of defence. The hotline will be used for the exchange of current information. Aside from it, it may be used by the Belarusian and American leaders, if need be. The hotline will start functioning this year.

PRAVDA carries an article by the former Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, now kept in custody, who is being accused of complicity in the August 1991 coup attempt together with other members of the State Emergency Committee. He suggests in his "economic project" that "food coupons, a sort of bread money" be introduced in Russia. According to Pavlov's calculations, every resident should receive part of his salary in the

form of food coupons, on which he will be given one kilogram of meat, sugar and cereals, one litre of vegetable oil, 500 grams of fish and butter and 10 kg of bread " with the cost on their lable, calculated on the basis of prices, which were taken into account during the calculation of minimum wages and pensions."

Press Review for 21 Jan

LD2101074193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0652 GMT 21 Jan

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 21 (TASS)—The media focus on the fate of the 40,000-strong population of the Abkhazian city of Tkvarcheli besieged by Georgian troops. "The city has been in a ring of blockade for five months. There is no bread, water or electricity. According to the Abkhazian side, people there die of starvation," writes KOMSOMSOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) reports that about 30 people have already died of starvation. TRUD reports that the Russian Government is trying to help the population of Tkvarcheli which is being unceasingly shelled and rocketed by Georgian troops.

A decision has been taken to give humanitarian aid to the population. Attempts are being made to take women, children and old men out of the besieged city. A Russian governmental commission has arrived in the conflict area to coordinate the operation of all services engaged in rescuing the residents of Tkvarcheli, TRUD notes.

Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander-in-chief of the CIS Armed Forces, shares his ideas in an interview with NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA (INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER) about the problem of the strategic nuclear forces of CIS countries.

There are differences between Russia and Ukraine over the issue, he points out. Russia and Ukraine differently approach the definition "the composition of strategic forces" which must be brought into line with the actual state of affairs. The issues will be considered at a CIS defence ministers' meeting which opens in the capital of Belarus on Thursday.

Under the headline "The Diplomacy of Decline", PRAVDA carries "bitter notes about Russia's foreign policy" by the newspaper's analyst Pavel Bogomolov who maintains that Russian diplomacy has now forgotten about Russia's national interests and engages in a "passive duplication of Western initiatives."

Analysing the activities of the Russian Foreign Ministry and its chief, Bogomolov arrives at a conclusion that Russian diplomacy cedes its positions in the foreign policy arena.

The country must, at last, work out a foreign policy concept regarding the defence of national interests as being of paramount importance, the news analyst emphasises.

PRAVDA carries an address to the compatriots by a large group of prominent political, public and cultural figures, scientists, and members of parliament who call on the people of Russia "to take under their protection the Serbian people who are faced with extermination."

"If the Serbians lose the Russians' support, they would disappear from the face of the earth because they will defend themselves to the last man. Subsequently it would be the turn of Orthodox Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians," the address emphasises.

TRUD lays emphasis on the struggle of various political forces over the forthcoming referendum on a new constitution. In an article headlined "Referendum's Orchestration in the Performance of Parties and Politicians," the newspaper points out that "the referendum in itself is of little interest to ordinary people." However, there is polarisation and unification of political forces, which in this or that way influence the future of Russian reforms over this so far problematic measure. TRUD observes that various political forces are stirring up passions instead of preparing for the referendum in a civilised and constructive way.

The problems of privatisation are the subject of an article in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. "Large-scale privatisation is beginning but the interests of servicemen are inadequately taken into account," the newspaper notes.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA emphasises that by virtue of the specific nature of military service, servicemen have limited possibilities for using privatisation cheques freely. Therefore, the newspaper believes, the military should be given equal opportunities for participating in the privatisation of state property.

Yeltsin Congratulates Clinton on Inauguration

LD2001183993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1721 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] Moscow January 20 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin has sent a message of greetings to U.S. President Bill Clinton in connection with his inauguration, circulated by the Russian President's Press Service on Wednesday [20 January]. The message says:

"Dear Mr. Clinton,

On behalf of the people of friendly Russia and myself I am conveying to you my sincere and warm congratulations on the occasion of your inauguration as the U.S. President.

I sincerely hope that during the years of your presidency the relations of partnership between Russia and the United States will further steadily develop and our coordinated actions will be a determining factor of peace, democracy and economic progress all over the world. On our part we shall do our best to achieve this vitally important goal.

I am confident that you, Mr. President, will make your contribution to the solution of current problems faced by our countries and the world community in the contemporary epoch.

Best wishes in your responsible activities for the benefit of the American people and for the benefit of the Russian-American partnership."

Further on Congratulations

LD2001110493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1053 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow January 20 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin congratulated U.S. President Bill Clinton with his inauguration on Wednesday [20 January] and called for an early Russian-U.S. summit.

Yeltsin told reporters that in a message to Clinton he expressed hope that the two great powers, Russia and the United States, will develop relations on the basis laid by former President George Bush and use the experience which had already been accumulated.

Russia hopes that it will remain a priority for the U.S. policy and that the dialogue between the two countries will not interrupt, according to Yeltsin who added that this is of a special importance as Russia and the U.S. remain major nuclear powers despite their decision to cut nuclear arsenals by two thirds.

"That is why we have to hold the hand not only on the (nuclear) button, but on the pulse of each other, and there should be no pause", Yeltsin said.

The Russian president wants to hold an early meeting with Clinton "if not in the framework of an official visit, then somewhere in a third country to discuss the list of issues which we are to implement in future to develop cooperation", he said.

Clinton Approach to Russia Assessed

PM2001165193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jan 93 Morning Edition p 4

[Stanislav Kondrashov commentary: "Bill Clinton and Russia's Problems"]

[Text] One more key element is being added to the new relations which are taking shape between Moscow and Washington as Bill Clinton moves into the White House. From now on the general picture of new elements will be as follows: There will be a new U.S. President, and what is more the first one born after World War II; there is a new post-Soviet Russia, and a new post-confrontational Europe.

Boris Yeltsin, himself a newcomer to the international scene, looks like a veteran compared to Clinton, although there is, of course, a stable political system behind the young President and, despite the succession of parties in power, there is continuity in the American foreign policy establishment. This is personified by 67-year-old Warren Christopher, who has been offered the post of secretary of state.

The unpredictable dynamics of Russia's development will have more influence on the nature of Russian-American relations than America's evolution, if you take their dependence on the internal situation in both countries into consideration. The prominent historian Arthur Schlesinger asserts that the United States, having brought the Reagan era to a conclusion during the Bush years, is entering the liberal and socially oriented phase of the next 30-year cycle of vacillation between conservatism and liberalism, whereas Russia has "gritted its teeth" and not just taken a leap into the market but abandoned itself to its new historical fate.

The old country of America and the new country of Russia are no longer rivals and want to be partners. In the coming years the framework and limits of this partnership, which have still to be determined, will have to be worked out in greater detail by trial and error. Only time will tell to what degree it will be stable. However, it is already clear that the partnership between Russia and the United States cannot and will not be an all-consuming question of life and death, as the nuclear and other military, global geopolitical rivalry was. The Russian president had an opportunity to satisfy himself that this was the case when Clinton politely declined his insistent calls for an urgent working meeting immediately after the American takes office.

When composing his agenda, Clinton cannot keep away from emphasizing the internal, largely economic problems, which were in fact the determining factor in his victory over George Bush. During the first days and weeks of his presidency, summits with foreign leaders

would look like he was breaking his election commitments. Moreover, by what logic should Clinton allow Russia to be put before Canada or Mexico—his neighbors to the north and south, or Western Europe and Japan—his strategic allies and economic rivals which are mounting a successful challenge?

In essence, by insisting on being seen out of turn, Yeltsin was pointing to the logic of superpower relations when one of their heads changes. But in the eyes of Washington and other Western capitals, Russia has not inherited the Soviet Union's superpower status, and the Russian president has not inherited the status of a superpower leader. Hence the refusal's increased level of politeness to help save face, but the scaled-down importance and urgency of American-Russian relations. However, what if scaling them down is a miscalculation? At the moment this is one of the most important questions worrying experienced Washington strategists. What if we allow this dangerous pause? People want to prevent this by an interim meeting between Kozyrev and Christopher. With the same view in mind the influential Senator Sam Nunn has proposed to Clinton that a special plenipotentiary coordinator for relations with Russia be appointed.

Despite all the new President's lack of experience in foreign affairs, he sees clearly that the USSR's unregulated legacy—first and foremost its nuclear legacy—which has failed to receive the attention it deserves, is fraught with dangers of a new type, which are much more serious than those Iraq and Somalia present. Due to the Yugoslav "black hole" peace is already a lost cause in the Balkans. If, with the armed conflicts on Russia's periphery and between the former Soviet republics, the "black hole" effect spreads to the former Union's central regions, Bush's hopes for a "new world order" under U.S. auspices will be buried in the years of the Clinton presidency among the ruins of the "new world disorder."

Of the 10 postwar Presidents, Bill Clinton is the first to miss the epoch of global confrontation with "communism." He is also the first who will have to realize that it will take a long time to see off this era.

While failing to persuade Clinton to meet him immediately, Yeltsin and the Russian diplomatic corps nevertheless achieved a strategic success when they managed to sign the START II Treaty, which the incoming President has approved, two weeks before Bush was to leave office. Radically developing the START I Treaty, the new treaty stipulates a two-thirds reduction of the two states' strategic offensive weapons by the year 2003. This is nothing less than a 10-year bridge from the past to the future of Russian-American relations. The necessity to ratify and implement the treaty binds the Russian leadership to the new American administration in Washington and gives the two presidents something they must do together until the end of their terms in office. If the bridge proves reliable, there will also be enough for their successors to do.

In a world which has ceased to be bipolar, the already complex matter of ensuring a system for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is becoming more complicated. Experts from several intelligence services reckon there are no less than 10 states which are candidates for the possession of, or maybe the covert possession of, nuclear weapons. Today problems are arising with Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus' transition to nuclear-free status. In accordance with the START II Treaty, Russia assumed a commitment to the United States to destroying the nuclear weapons on the territories of the three new states. Of them, Ukraine is the most insistent in its demands for international, first and foremost American, guarantees of its security as a quid pro quo, as well as for as many dollars as possible in aid along the way to nuclear-free status.

Unfortunately, you cannot see any considered strategy for Russia's relations with the other CIS states. Sometimes you get the impression that Moscow would like to make up for their absence by having special relations with Washington. As during Bush's term, Yeltsin is, clearly, counting not so much on the effectiveness of his contacts with Kravchuk as on assistance (and if needs be pressure from the United States) when issues of the USSR's nuclear legacy are being resolved.

As is the case with Bush, Clinton will put assisting the Russian economic reform first. But what can he put forward here that is essentially new taking into consideration how constrained his "domestic" position is? This first year of the economic reform has dashed the hopes for miracles to take place using aid from the IMF and the G-7 countries—with which the young enthusiasts from "Gaydar's team" inspired the Russians. What we already knew has been borne out: It is only possible to fruitfully help those people who help themselves. Especially when it is a question of such an enormous country as Russia.

Self-help as a prerequisite for outside aid bringing results means that there must be firm and effective authorities, intelligible laws in operation, and political stability. Stability is achieved either by establishing an authoritarian regime or first and foremost through the interaction of the two branches of power, the president and the Supreme Soviet. The December accord on stabilizing the constitutional system in Russia does not, alas, seem durable. Judging by several appointments made in recent days, the sides are getting ready for a new round of confrontations before the April referendum.

You may ask what this has to do with Bill Clinton and his approach to Russia? Indeed, the United States' influence on our internal development can in no way be decisive. Nevertheless, by having good relations, constructive contacts with the new as well as with the old U.S. President, the Russian president and his entourage, in particular his minister of foreign affairs, see additional capital and valuable support for the battle within Russia. For its part the American establishment links the success of the reform and democracy in Russia with

Yeltsin's fate, just as before him perestroyka's success was linked with Gorbachev's name.

This is how the foreign, American card is being played in the chaos and anarchy in Russia. What is more, it is not only those people who call themselves democrats but also those who are called national patriots who are doing this. This card is a two-edged sword. For the first group it is a token of their democratic credentials, for the second group it is a convenient argument about intervention from across the ocean, about Russia being "sold off." As a result of playing the American card, society becomes all the more polarized.

Washington, of course, has its own extremists, which this suits fine. But one must assume that the majority of the new team of "political actors" do not come into that category, as those of the old one did not either. If the confrontation in the Russian authorities intensifies, the Clinton administration will be faced with two questions which are more acute than the previous one: Is the deepening of the rift in Russian society—which is not just between comparatively small groups but also between the radical democrats and the many centrists—helping the reform and democracy to succeed? What is more in the long-term interests of the United States: whipping up a civil confrontation, unequivocally taking one side in it, or, on the contrary, "reconciling" the sides in conflict and instilling in them the concept of civilized behavior, which although it may lengthen the road to democracy, will make it safer and more certain?

From the viewpoint of mature politics, as well as of Christian ethics, the reply, it seems, is obvious: Don't incite people but bring them together. Such an approach will pay for itself from a political viewpoint, as in the final analysis it will engender a respectful attitude to itself in the various camps in Russian politics.

Clinton's Political Course Options Assessed

PM2101105593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 20 Jan 93 p 2

[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI "Experts' Opinion": "Clinton Administration: Assessment of Possible Course"]

[Text] The program of actions of the new U.S. President B. Clinton and his administration in the field of domestic, foreign, and military policy is at the development stage and will be reflected in a series of documents in January-February 1993, primarily in the president's "State of the Union" speech, his budget message to Congress, the President's "National Security Strategy" report, and others.

The existing practice in the United States attests that regardless of which party the White House incumbent represents, the determining thing in the formation and implementation of his policy is a developed and virtually unvarying scale of national values, interests, and aims.

An analysis of B. Clinton's election statements and the positions of the people in his entourage who formulate the platform of his domestic and foreign policy make it possible at this stage to believe that the new U.S. President is putting foremost the task of economic revival as an essential condition for the United States to retain the position and authority of a power that is world leader.

In the economic field B. Clinton intends to pay special attention to reducing the federal budget deficit (over $4 trillion) and the foreign trade deficit (over $100 billion), to reducing the foreign debt (about $600 billion), and halting the slump in industrial production. The measures he proposes include creating an economic security council, elaborating a package of measures to protect U.S. goods on the world market, implementing a program to increase the effectiveness of small and medium business, accelerating the creation of sophisticated technologies, improving the quality of education, and reforming the federal state service. All this could influence the reduction of U.S. aid to foreign states and a certain alteration of emphasis in U.S. foreign policy. At the same time the concentration of efforts on the solution of domestic, economic, and social problems will not, in the estimation of U.S. political scientists, lead to U.S. isolationism or the rejection of global positions.

In the foreign policy field B. Clinton's administration intends to retain continuity in "the United States' fulfillment of its commitments as the only world superpower in order to promote democracy and freedom and restrict the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction."

The new president and his entourage are convinced that in the forthcoming years the United States will come up against a whole series of threats and challenges: The possibility of an armed conflict between former Soviet republics, the emergence of an extreme nationalist totalitarian regime in Russia, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, the continuing tension in a number of parts of the world.

To neutralize these and other possible threats the new administration considers it essential to keep U.S. armed forces as the most powerful in the world. B. Clinton has said that "strength is the basis of successful diplomacy and military might has always had fundamental importance in international relations."

To resolve regional conflicts B. Clinton and his companions believe it is most acceptable to create and use permanent UN Armed Forces while not ruling out the likelihood and necessity of using only U.S. armed forces in certain circumstances to resolve crises on terms to their advantage.

The new U.S. President has repeatedly expressed himself in favor of developing relations with Russia and the other CIS countries, declaring that the victory of reforms in the Russian Federation will enable the United States to reduce military expenditure, will lessen the threat of

the outbreak of nuclear war, and will ensure U.S. business access to the Russian market rich in natural resources. But B. Clinton has not assumed any commitments, particularly on the plane of economic aid to the Russian Federation (CIS). The West cannot guarantee Russia's prosperity, he has stated, but can and must "give it a chance to win."

In the opinion of U.S. business circles, in the next few years the United States will hardly render the Russian Federation large-scale economic aid. B. Clinton's government could appeal to private companies to develop business relations with Russia and to invest money in its economy.

According to U.S. experts' assessments, in 20-25 years Russia could emerge from the crisis and become a mighty economic and military power, the United States' main rival, outstripping many large Western countries. Here account is taken of the Russian Federation's enormous intellectual potential, unique natural resources, and prospects for the development of its industrial base.

It is expected that in Europe the new U.S. President's policy will be aimed at preserving the European system of security and fulfilling U.S. commitments to NATO. At the same time the strengthening of integration processes in Europe in the military sphere with the retention of serious economic problems in the United States could lead to Washington's review of its commitments in Europe in the direction of their reduction. In relations with the East European countries the new administration intends to steer a course toward the consolidation of their ties with the West in the military and economic fields.

The implementation of B. Clinton's premise regarding the need to pursue a more "aggressive" foreign policy with a view to "strengthening democracy abroad" will inevitably lead to a tougher approach toward relations with China which, in the assessment of the future White House incumbent, is violating human rights. The new U.S. President has also expressed himself sharply and categorically regarding the "despotic regimes" of Iraq, Libya, Cuba, the DPRK, Syria, and a number of other countries.

In the sphere of military policy B. Clinton has stated his intention to reduce military appropriations, amend the avenues of the building of the armed forces, and elaborate a new military strategy. B. Clinton's election as the new president has given rise to a certain caution in top U.S. military circles, who fear overhasty and unconsidered decisions which could damage the armed forces' potential to safeguard the country's security and national interests on the global and regional scales.

B. Clinton's policy statements on military problems attest to the future president's intention to continue to rely on nuclear and conventional deterrence. "While reducing our armed forces we cannot forget the retention of our security," B. Clinton stated. "U.S. military might should remain a force which influences stability in the world...."

The future U.S. leadership intends to carry out the conversion of the country's military-industrial complex only after Congress has developed and adopted a comprehensive federal program without causing no damage to the country's mobilization readiness and without reducing expenditure on scientific research and experimental design work in important fields of science and technology.

In connection with the change in the nature of the threats to U.S. national security and interests, B. Clinton has suggested reducing military expenditure by 33 percent (of the 1992 level) by 1997 and reducing the armed forces' numerical strength to 1.4 million.

In the field of strategic offensive forces the B. Clinton administration will to a considerable extent retain the continuity of the course of the present U.S. leadership in programs for building and in the aims of the negotiation process with Russia. The enshrinement in treaties and laws of the provisions of the framework agreement will probably be the new administration's most immediate task. Here we should expect the U.S. side to try to expand the sphere of the regime of inspections and continuous observation, suggesting that it be extended to establishments for the production, storage, and utilization of nuclear warheads.

In the field of strategic defense forces the new administration's efforts will be directed toward seeking ways of defending the continental part of the United States and also U.S. establishments and troops in forward zones from operational-tactical ballistic missiles and offensive air weapons. The B. Clinton administration will hardly subject the SDI program to a radical revision.

The development of general-purpose forces in the U.S. Armed Forces will be implemented in accordance with the proposals drafted by B. Clinton's advisers, which provide in the period through 1997 for a somewhat more substantial reduction by comparison with the G. Bush administration's program.

There are grounds for supposing that B. Clinton's cabinet will take as a guideline the reduction of the U.S. Armed Forces' personnel to 2.5 million (including a reduction of the regular components to 1.6 million), and a reduction in the number of combined-arms divisions to 20, in the number of equivalent tactical aviation air wings from 36 to 26, and in the number of warships to 350, including a reduction in the number of aircraft carriers to 12.

B. Clinton's policy statements note that for the U.S. Armed Forces' general-purpose forces options have been elaborated for more radical reductions which could be implemented with a consideration for the development of the military-political situation in the world.

Conclusions: 1. B. Clinton's Democratic administration will be formed actively over the course of December 1992 through January 1993 and in the subsequent period. The continuing uncertainty regarding candidates for key posts in the cabinet complicates the forecasting and assessment of the course of the president's future team.

Experience shows that the election statements of the president and vice president could undergo substantial revisions in the process of their term in power.

2. U.S. specialists predict that B. Clinton and A. Gore will to a considerable extent inherit the political approaches and ideological dogmas inherent in U.S. presidents and governments from the Democratic Party: heightened attention toward domestic economic and social problems, a more orthodox defense of U.S. prestige and national interests in the international arena, the measured development of relations with allies and partners, the tougher linkage of the course with regard to Russia and the CIS with problems like the observance of arms control agreements, the reduction of armed forces and the military budget, the withdrawal of troops from the Baltic, human rights, and so forth.

3. In the opinion of representatives of the U.S. military command who in their overwhelming majority voted for G. Bush and are awaiting B. Clinton's innovations with the utmost guardedness, the new administration will share the Republicans' view that in 20-25 years Russia will be a country of "enormous economic and military importance" and the main competitor and chief "challenge" to U.S. national interests. This conclusion implies a circumspect approach, based on considerations of expediency, toward the development of relations between the United States and the Russian Federation on all salients, primarily a departure from large-scale economic, technical, and financial aid.

4. B. Clinton's future administration does not intend to renounce "nuclear and conventional deterrence" or the maintenance of the country's military potential at a high level. The new president has promised to reduce military expenditure by one third (of the 1992 level) and the numerical strength of the regular armed forces to 1.4 million (in peace time), focusing attention on the priority of qualitative parameters and the improvement of the strategic deployment base.

The new president advocates an outwardly more profound reduction of individual components of the U.S. general-purpose forces (reducing the Armed Forces grouping in Germany to 100,000 instead of 150,000, reducing the number of multipurpose aircraft carriers from 12 to 10, and so forth) than that planned by G. Bush but while maintaining the U.S. Armed Forces' combat potential at a level which ensures for the United States the status of the only superpower with the most powerful armed forces.

5. In his election statements B. Clinton showed himself to be a supporter of the implementation of a from a position of strength policy in the international arena. A preliminary analysis of his statements and the potential of the future administration makes it possible to conclude that military organizational development in the United States will be largely implemented along avenues and programs which have already been elaborated, proceeding from the need to preserve the United States' dominant position in the world arena.

Clinton's Chances of 'Fresh Start' Pondered

PM2001144393 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 3

[Ye. Popov article: "A Fresh Start. Tomorrow Will See the Inauguration of the 42d President of the United States—Bill Clinton"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] It is no surprise that any biographical details or character traits of the head of a state which is currently the only superpower in the world are being put under the magnifying glass by political analysts. Much has already been said and written about Bill Clinton, and there can be no doubt that there will be many more extremely contradictory opinions on this topic.

It seems that the expert opinion of Morton Abramowitz, director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, deserves special attention: "In foreign affairs George Bush is passing on bad cards to Clinton, who cannot easily reshuffle the deck. Nor can Clinton take his chips and quit the table."

The impression is being created that the outgoing administration, by getting involved in a whole series of escapades right up to its last few days, has deliberately done its utmost to complicate Clinton's game with regard to the "chips" of which he spoke with such inspiration and conviction during the election campaign.

At the time Clinton branded Bush's foreign policy a "failure" and linked it directly with the flawed economic course inside the country and the implementation of the so-called Reaganomic blueprint. Comparisons bring things into focus. The 12-year tenure of power by the Reagan and Bush Republican administrations has brought the United States to a state of total economic bankruptcy. The federal budget deficit has more than trebled from 79 billion to 290 billion. Government borrowing has reached astronomical levels in excess of $3 trillion. Almost the only area in which America prospered during these years was the more than 75-percent increase in the incomes of the richest Americans—who make up just 1 percent of taxpayers—while the incomes of the poorest Americans were cut, which gave Bill Clinton and his Vice President Albert Gore cause to state: "...For over a decade our government has played the swindler and acted in the interests of the rich."

Putting forward the idea that "a weak domestic policy does not allow us to pursue a strong foreign policy," Clinton promised voters that he would "focus like a laser beam on the economy."

There can hardly be any doubt that it is precisely in this sense that there is a real chance of a "fresh start." The immediate future will show whether Clinton intends to play his campaign "chips," and, more importantly, whether he will be able to do so.

Commentary Views U.S.-Russian Relations Under Clinton

LD2001131193 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Yuriy Solton commentary; read by announcer]

[Text] In Washington at noon Thursday [as heard] local time Bill Clinton will be sworn in on Capitol Hill as the 42d President of the United States. A representative of the Democrats moves into the White House after the Republicans have been in office there for the past 12 years. Here's Radio Moscow news analyst Yuriy Solton taking a look at what Russian-American relations could be under the new administration. He makes the following points:

The era of military confrontation which threatened to develop into a nuclear conflict is now in the past. At that time relations between Moscow and Washington used to determine to a large extent the course of world events and it seems to me it would be wrong to minimize their influence and importance today.

Indeed the cold war is over, but its aftermath still remains. The disappearance of a bipolar system in the world has led to a multitude of large-scale interethnic and religious conflicts. There is now a danger that in place of a new world order there could be a new world disorder. And the solution of a new problem, as well as keeping stability in the world, would depend to a great extent on whether Russia, which remains a significant power after the breakup of the Soviet Union, and the United States find a common language.

The Bush administration leaves behind a good heritage in that respect. Russia and the United States have decided to build relations as partners and in the future even as allies, if this turns out to be possible.

Important agreements have been signed concerning bilateral cooperation as well as approaches to settling regional conflicts. The two countries concluded a major treaty on reducing by two-thirds their nuclear strategic weapons in the course of 10 years. But it is the Clinton administration which will be implementing these agreements and defining the framework and limits of Russia and the United States partnership.

The first steps in that direction seem to be encouraging. Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton have established contacts. They exchange messages and discuss problems in their telephone conversations. Moscow is ready to go further along the way paved by the Bush administration. And of course it can only be welcomed that Bill Clinton has confirmed the continuity of the former U.S. course as regards Russia.

What's more, he expressed the intention to carry out that course more energetically and give practical support to the democratic changes going on in the Russian Federation, as well as in other former Soviet republics.

The question is also being raised about a working meeting of the leaders of the two countries. Of course, time is needed to prepare for this. Besides, Bill Clinton should first get to the root of problems at home. But neither Moscow nor Washington intend to have any dangerous pauses. Talks are soon to be held between Russia's Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Warren Christopher, who has been offered the office of America's secretary of state.

Moscow congratulates Bill Clinton on his inauguration and views with optimism the future of Russian-United States relations. The hope is likewise expressed that those relations will be further developed under the new administration.

Clinton's Effect on U.S.-Russian Ties Viewed

LD1901222093 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov]

[Text] How can the arrival at the White House of Bill Clinton affect America's relations with Russia? Our commentary on the subject is by Vladislav Kozyakov.

It should be said that in the sphere of international relations the new American President gets a rich legacy. It is first of all relations of partnership recorded in major bilateral agreements. And what is probably more important, he inherits the mutual commitment of Moscow and Washington to good neighborliness and democracy. In this sense one can speak about a return to the various sources of cooperation or to those days when the President of the Continental Congress of the United States, Samuel Huntington [one of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence], thanked Russia, the great and good ally.

Yet new times produce new problems. At the present stage the attention of the United States, just as many other countries, is focused on democratic reforms in Russia. Judging by what Bill Clinton said on the matter during the election campaign, he fully supports such reforms. More than once he criticized the outgoing Administration for being too slow in assisting Russia. As the President-elect said, the democratic changes in the former Soviet republics and their advance to a market economy were consonant with American ideals. He called aid to them an investment in America's future.

And that, it seems, was not merely an election campaign slogan. Last Monday, speaking at Georgetown University, Bill Clinton described assistance to the process of reforms in the former Soviet Union as a priority for his Administration.

Yet no matter how important assistance to the Russian reforms is, relations between Moscow and Washington go far beyond this sphere. In fact there is a mutual need for cooperation with regard to any major international issue. It is simply impossible to imagine how the problems of nuclear security can be solved without implementing the START I and START II Treaties signed by the two countries. Or how can any effective measures be taken to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons without Russian-American cooperation? The same is true of settling local crises, be that in Yugoslavia, the Middle East or the Persian Gulf.

Such conflicts inevitably raise the issue of collective measures under United Nations aegis. And the possibility of taking such measures depends on agreement between Russia and the United States at the United Nations Security Council. There is no doubt that the new American President will try to back his country's relations of partnership with Russia by deeds. For example, a summit could serve it, and Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton have already discussed the possibility of such a meeting. As for reaching new agreements, this could be done on the basis of respect of mutual interests. And of course neither side should dictate to the other side any terms running counter to the legitimate interests of either of them—something the outgoing Administration and the former United States Congress practice sometimes.

The partnership between Russia and the United States can be deepened if it develops on the basis of mutual understanding and equality, that is, principles as old as the world. Commentary was by Vladislav Kozyakov.

Commentary Views Bush's Iraqi 'Heritage' to Clinton

LD2001220493 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Commentary by Vladislav Kozyakov; from the "News and Views" program]

[Text] The new U.S. President Bill Clinton has received a burdensome heritage with the situation in the Persian Gulf. Within hours before his transfer to the White House, explosions roared in Iraq of American, as well as British and French bombs and missiles with dozens of people killed. A commentary from our news analyst Vladislav Kozyakov:

The election motto of the incoming president was a need for change in America. Shortly before his inauguration Mr. Clinton made a reminder that he saw the essence of his presidency in a new spirit of innovation. A day before the swearing-in ceremony he said "I desperately want to make a difference". Rather than not, Bill Clinton meant above all his resolve to take a fresh look at the domestic problems in the minds of Americans. But the events before the coming into office of the 42d president happened in such a way that the spirit of innovation was badly needed also for the foreign policy of the United States, for such a policy in the Persian Gulf that would best respond to the national interests of the country and for the rest of the world community.

Of course it is out of the question there ought to be any departure from the most stern demands to the Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn that he should strictly comply with the UN Security Council resolutions. A fresh look is needed to define the methods and means to achieve this goal. Will the White House be ready to look for a nonstandard solution of this matter? What seemed to be favorable signals came from Baghdad shortly before the inauguration. Iraq had announced a cease-fire and agreed to flights of UN inspectors and their planes in Iraq as well as giving up further incursions by Iraqi detachments in Kuwait. However, almost simultaneously there came in reports that a second American aircraft carrier John Kennedy, accompanied by two cruisers, is sailing toward the crisis region. The three vessels are to arrive in the Eastern Mediterranean, from where they can reach Iraqi territory with their Tomahawk missiles.

A number of leaders of the just-gone U.S. Administration, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell, recommend bombing Iraqi troops if Baghdad keeps violating UN resolutions. In short, the new U.S. president faces a dilemma: Either to send bombs and missiles or to opt for talks. A new approach would naturally require dialogue. Calls for that are being made by the Vatican, by leaders of Arab countries and by governments and political leaders in a number of Western countries. The Russian government is worried about the position of scores of its citizens who are staying in Iraq. Russia also urges the United States to use the UN mechanism. The UN Security Council should review the situation again before force is used. This is the stand of Moscow.

The broadest ever coalition of states created in the United Nations two years ago with the involvement of the United States, Russia and a number of Arab countries following Iraq's aggression in Kuwait, must not be just an episode. Joint actions by states must become a constant practice in dealing with international crises. If the White House opted for such a constant priority, that would be real innovation by the American presidency, its new word in history.

Iraqi Envoy to Moscow Holds News Conference

LD2001203993 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1600 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] A news conference was held at the Iraqi Embassy in Moscow today, attended by our correspondent Nikolay Giliskiy. The news conference was devoted to

the recent development of the situation in Iraq. Iraqi ambassador Ghafil Jasim Husayn spoke at the news conference, stating the stance of his country's leadership on the latest events surrounding Iraq. The Iraqi ambassador said:

[Begin Husayn recording] The U.S. Administration and its allies have concocted a number of problems, one of which was the refusal to allow UN inspectors to enter Iraqi airspace through the no-fly zone which was imposed by them on southern Iraq in violation of international law and Security Council resolutions. This was, furthermore, rejected by Iraq because of its inability to ensure the safety of inspectors for the very fact that their planes would be overflying the no-fly zone at the same time as the aircraft of the United States, Britain, and France.

Iraq agreed to allow inspectors to enter Iraq through Jordanian airspace because of its inability, from a practical point of view, to shoulder full responsibility for the safety of the aircraft used by the UN; Iraq can only do so when it has full control over its airspace and when U.S., British, and French aircraft stop violating our airspace. [end recording]

As far as concerns the dispute over the border between Iraq and Kuwait, the ambassador said:

[Begin Husayn recording] As for the retrieval of Iraqi weapons from the demilitarized zone, it was carried out in accordance with the agreement of the head of the inspectors' commission, who allowed Iraq to retrieve such weapons until the 15th of this month. Nevertheless, the latest missile aggression, which was carried out by the United States, took place to uncover the U.S. falsehood and the deeply rooted rancor against our people and our national achievements. The U.S. missiles hit a factory which was used to produce equipment for the Iraqi civilian industry; it was not, as the United States claimed, used for the production of nuclear weapons, a matter which was affirmed by the UN inspection teams.

Iraq, which has implemented most of its commitments under the UN Security Council resolution, cannot possibly accept what the United States, Britain, and France are trying to impose in the name of the Security Council, particularly their attempts to divide Iraq and to harm its independence and sovereignty by imposing no-go zones in its northern and southern parts. The Iraqi people, under the leadership of His Excellency President Saddam Husayn, reject all U.S., British, and French blackmailing methods, and will resist all imperialist challenges. Victory will be theirs because they have right on their side and because they are defending a just cause. [end recording]

Urges Russia To Condemn Allied 'Aggression'

PM1901193793 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jan 93 p 3

[Report by Ravil Mustafin; "We Favor Dialogue. Iraqi Ambassador's News Conference"]

[Text] Iraqi Ambassador to Russia Ghafil Jasim Husayn held a news conference in Moscow yesterday on "the 17 January 1993 U.S. aggression against Iraq." The ambassador said that the plant in the suburbs of Baghdad that was attacked by Tomahawk cruise missiles was not a nuclear facility. It had been visited on repeated occasions by UN inspection teams. The "Al-Rashid" hotel in the Iraqi capital also came under attack. According to the ambassador, it again demonstrates the "Bush administration's criminal intentions and false claims." Two members of the hotel staff were killed and workers, employees, and some foreigners were injured, including a Briton staying in the hotel. Another U.S. Tomahawk missile fell on a house in the Baghdad district of Karrada.

Concerning Russia's stance on the conflict and bilateral relations between Moscow and Baghdad, the ambassador said that, although Russia had not participated in the aggression, it had not condemned the actions by the United States and its allies. At the same time, the Iraqi ambassador said, the aggression had been carried out as a result of a decision by the United States, Britain, and France and not by the United Nations, which contravenes international law. Russia is a permanent member of the UN Security Council. We appeal to the Russian leadership to condemn this aggression and to insist at the UN Security Council on the unswerving implementation of all resolutions concerning the Palestinians.

The Iraqi diplomat also announced that Russia had recently asked Iraq to receive a Russian representative in Baghdad to discuss with the Iraqi leadership matters relating to the development of relations between the two countries. But the other day, the ambassador said, it was announced that his trip to Iraq had been postponed.

In reply to the question of what Iraq expects from the new U.S. Administration, the ambassador said that it is difficult to judge at the moment how the new White House incumbent will behave. According to the diplomat, Iraq is opposed to threats and provocations and would like the great powers to abandon the policy of double standards.

U.S. Actions, Policy Toward Iraq Questioned

LD2001220293 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1730 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] Iraq's Saddam Husayn has announced a cessation of combat operations as of today. However, a spokesman of the Clinton administration, which is assuming office, has adopted a highly skeptical attitude toward the proposal. Here is how that situation is commented upon by international affairs journalist Aleksandr Levchenko.

[Levchenko] The massive use of cruise missiles against Iraq and the strict monitoring of its airspace marks the start of a new stage in the American-Iraqi confrontation. Yes, Saddam Husayn has undoubtedly breached the cease-fire agreement since the Gulf war. The appearance on Kuwait's territory of his civilian and military personnel is an example of this, and by the way, it is not the

only testimony to this. It is impossible to describe the subsequent steps by the United States and a few other allies in the former anti-Iraqi coalition as an adequate response to the Iraqi president.

One of the cruise missiles fell in the center of the city near the luxurious Al-Rashid hotel, traditionally the residence par excellence of foreign correspondents working in Iraq. The hotel itself hardly represents a target in military terms: Believe me, I spent almost two weeks there after the war in the Gulf. But here is what is revealing: Two years ago a similar Tomahawk cruise missile landed in exactly the same place near the very same Al-Rashid hotel, but fortunately did not explode. As the American missile launcher crewmen stated, since then no one had changed the programs for the guidance computers.

Along with this, the political directives themselves of two years' standing vis-a-vis Baghdad have also not been changed, even though since that moment serious changes have taken place in the Islamic world: While previously Iraq's aggression against Kuwait was condemned, now messages from Cairo, Rabat, Tehran and Islamabad speak not only of anxiety at the development of events in the region but also openly condemn the U.S. military action.

I do not rule out the possibility of future military pressure by the United States on Iraq leading to a diametrically opposite result, namely: Increased solidarity with Iraq in the Islamic countries that oppose attempts at (?territorial division).

The Saddam regime, however unattractive it is to the Americans, is an objective reality that has to be taken into account.

Contrary to political predictions, the Iraqi President has kept his job, even after the crushing defeat in the Gulf and after the mass uprisings in his country. Plots to physically remove him can only lead an escalation of combat operations in Iraq and new human casualties.

U.S. Actions Said To Give Husayn 'Moral Superiority'

MK2001143793 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 3

[Mikhail Shchipanov commentary under "Our Commentary" rubric: "A Strike, Another Strike..."]

[Text] And so the outgoing President Bush marked his move into well earned retirement with yet another salvo in a funeral salute to Iraq. A strike has now been made directly on Baghdad, despite claims that the 30 cruise missiles launched were exclusively aimed only at some facility somehow connected with the Iraqi nuclear program. However, no matter what specious pretext was put forward on this occasion and no matter how provocatively the odious Baghdad leader behaved, the new action looks somewhat excessive. It is as if Bush hurried, while he still had the chance, to belatedly vent his pain and resentment on the dictator who humiliated him. Yet it is Husayn, crushed and humiliated, who will remain in power.

It is, however, clear that Husayn will also survive the latest attack. What is more, the master of Iraq has now acquired clear moral superiority. The blood of civilians shed in Baghdad is enabling him to create an effective propaganda backdrop against which Husayn can launch an emotional appeal to his Arab brethren. Moreover, if it is true that the reason Husayn was so active in provoking the West was because he was under pressure from his own generals, who reproached their commander in chief for his unforgivable passivity, Saddam will now easily shut them all up. After all, it turns out that he "had no intention of bowing to enemies and is only prepared to retreat under pressure of brute force," which, as you know, is the last straw.

The United States may now find itself in the role of Don Quixote, who defended a shepherd, with whom his vengeful master later settled the score. First, some analysts think that Saddam Husayn may vent his spleen on his own Kurds, stepping up hostilities against them in order to boost morale among his own troops. Moreover, even neighboring Arab countries will not bring themselves to charge Husayn with brutality: They say that this is an internal Iraqi dispute.

Nor will the United Nations be in the best position now, since the Third World is now starting to perceive it as an umbrella for U.S. strong-arm policy. It looks as though, having won the United Nations' permission two years ago to use force, the Yanks can now punish and pardon anyone at their own discretion. But that impression threatens to undermine the cooperation between the children of various peoples under U.N. auspices established following the end of the cold war.

Foreign Ministry Statement on Iraq Viewed

PM1901192993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jan 93 p 3

[Report by Andrey Kamorin: "Russia Objects to Escalation of Military Actions in Iraq"]

[Text] The Russian Foreign Ministry issued a statement Monday in connection with the military actions by the United States and its allies against Iraq.

The Russian Foreign Ministry blames Baghdad for the exacerbation of the situation leading to military actions and casualties among the civilian population, due to its failure to heed the world community's repeated warnings. At the same time, the statement says: "We are firmly of the opinion that the reaction to Iraq's actions must be appropriate and based solely on agreed decisions. Evidently there is a need for a review of the situation at the UN Security Council."

The information is that consultations at the Security Council, convened at the Russian delegation's request, will take place Thursday. Does this show that Russia has departed from the policy of the anti-Saddam coalition?

Maybe the West's concern on this score is premature. Russia obviously does not intend to abandon support for the international sanctions against Baghdad, let alone offer Saddam Husayn the hand of friendship. The Foreign Ministry statement looks more like a very gentle reminder to the United States that it is acting in Iraq on the basis of an international mandate and must not see it as carte blanche for the allies to take any action.

Let us not forget either that the Russian Foreign Ministry has to keep one eye on the opposition: The bombing raids against Iraq have already provoked picketing of the U.S. missions in Moscow and St. Petersburg.

Opponents of the president and government both inside and outside parliament have long been playing the "Iraq card"—and not without success—by attacking Minister Kozyrev and, through him, executive authority in general.

The Foreign Ministry statement may also be intended to some extent for domestic consumption. The document enables the foreign policy department to take exception to possible overreaction in the world community's policy vis-a-vis Iraq, without calling the policy itself into question.

But all these facts are well known in Washington and New York. A note of caution on Moscow's part is hardly likely to make any adjustment to the situation concerning Iraq.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Questions Russian Policy on Iraq

PM1901155193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 3

[Ravil Mustafin article: "What Lies Behind Repeat Strike Against Iraq"]

[Text] On Sunday evening the United States carried out a repeat strike against Iraq. According to White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater, it was carried out by Tomahawk cruise missiles. U.S. and allied aircraft did not participate in the operation. According to an AP report citing an unnamed Pentagon spokesman, the missiles were launched from the U.S. Navy cruiser Cowpens and the destroyers Hewitt and Stump in the Persian Gulf and also from the destroyer Caron in the Red Sea. Their target was a plant located approximately 20 km southeast of Baghdad, where, according to U.S. data, work is being carried out on the creation of nuclear weapons. The cruise missiles were fitted with nonnuclear warheads weighing approximately 450 kg each.

Iraqi officials maintain that this was an ordinary machine plant, having no bearing on the production of nuclear weapons. David Kid, spokesman for the International Atomic Energy Agency, has declared that "the enterprise in itself was not of value." UN experts have repeatedly inspected that installation and drawn the conclusion that it is "totally inactive." Although the enterprise was destroyed, none of the workers was injured, a REUTERS correspondent reports.

It is also still not quite clear what happened at the Rashid Hotel in Baghdad, where two people died and 31 were injured as the result of an explosion. At first the Iraqis maintained that they succeeded in shooting down one of the cruise missiles in the skies over Baghdad and that it was debris from it that fell on the hotel. But then Hamid Hammadi, Iraqi minister of culture and information, declared that it was no accident that the U.S. missile hit the hotel. An Islamic conference was taking place there, and what happened essentially "was a simple act of terrorism by the Bush administration," he said.

A White House spokesman did not rule out the possibility of other operations of this kind being carried out against Iraq until "Iraq starts to fulfill" the UN resolutions.

A number of news agencies report that the actions of Iraqi aircraft in the "forbidden zone" south of the 32d parallel, which attacked U.S. aircraft patrolling there, provided the immediate grounds for the repeat strike against Iraq. One Iraqi aircraft was downed as a result of the aerial battle.

At the same time the United States has completed the transfer to Kuwait of a battalion of 1,000 men, which began last Wednesday. The battalion will be stationed along the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border.

As is known, Iraq subjected Israel to missile attacks during the war in the Persian Gulf. A missile attack was expected in Israel this time too. But one did not follow, an ITAR-TASS correspondent reports from Tel Aviv. Nevertheless, the Israelis are maintaining enhanced vigilance, and the adhesive tape has been applied to the windows of houses, and vehicles have been bound with sticky tape. At the same time a spokesman for the Israeli Army has given an assurance that the services responsible for the country's security are following the development of the situation in Iraq and are ready to take "appropriate actions."

ITAR-TASS reports that the UN special commission tackling questions of Baghdad's disarmament has postponed its inspectors' flight to Baghdad, having rejected the Iraqi terms for ensuring flight safety.

Britain and Japan have stated their support for the military action taken Sunday. British Prime Minister John Major declared that the missile strike was made after intensive consultations among the allied powers. Japanese Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe, who is visiting Spain, believes that the U.S. actions against Iraq were "inevitable as a result of the fact that Baghdad has repeatedly violated UN resolutions."

France has reacted quite laconically to the missile attack on Iraq. AFP points out that the laconic nature of the

French reaction and the wording in which it is couched suggest the thought that Paris has decided to keep its distance and that France might have had reservations in respect of this operation or at least its targets. This is not surprising, for this time the missile strike was made against the suburbs of Baghdad—which can in no way be excused by the need to ensure flights by the Western allies' aircraft over the "forbidden zones" in the north and south of the country.

Mention must also be made of the fact that definite international opposition to the military actions of the United States and its closest allies in respect of Iraq has also become apparent. At any rate, many Arab states have voiced serious concern and have even condemned those actions. As is known, the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet has also held a special sitting, at which a number of people's deputies accused Russia's foreign policy of aiding and abetting "the U.S. aggression against Iraq."

The statement by a Russian Federation Foreign Ministry spokesman—which is, incidentally, the only document to date which expresses Moscow's official position on the conflict—says that Russia proceeds from the premise that the action by the Western coalition forces was carried out in the context of the international community's efforts to ensure compliance with the decisions collectively adopted under UN auspices on eliminating the consequences of Iraqi aggression. There are, however, a number of questions, the answers to which can hardly be found by proceeding only from the context mentioned in the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement of 14 January.

Why, for example, do the United States and its allies display such an intensely pained reaction to Iraq, while at the same time not noticing other violators of UN resolutions? How can the West's manifest haste in implementing through the UN Security Council the resolutions which permit the use of force against Iraq be accounted for? As is known, the embargo policy was abandoned even before it yielded the first results. Finally, what can account for a number of juridical inconsistencies connected with the introduction of "forbidden zones" over the southern and northern regions of Iraq? The UN Security Council has not adopted any decisions in this respect. There is merely its resolution 688, which condemns the Iraqi authorities' repression of Kurds and Shiites. The United States and its allies used that resolution to introduce the forbidden zones, which Iraq, incidentally, does not recognize as legitimate.

Meanwhile, Washington closed its eyes for almost 15 years to Saddam Husayn's many pranks [prodelka]. Moreover, in his time President Reagan even excluded Iraq from the list of states which were pursuing a policy of terrorism. People in the West even kept quiet when Saddam began using chemical weapons against Kurds and Iranians. Not to mention the mass violations of human rights during the bloody purges which the ruler of Baghdad carried out in his own country.

Instead of censure and the adoption of tough resolutions and sanctions, money and weapons poured into Iraq. The secret was simple: Baghdad was a bastion in the way of the spread of the Islamic revolution from Tehran. The concerned West and oil-rich Arab countries did everything to ensure that Baghdad held out and won the Iraq-Iran war. Iraq emerged from it with pumped-up military muscles, possessing a million-strong army and feeling itself to be a regional superpower.

But the chief thing was that S. Husayn's actions no longer fitted into the Western scenarios. Particular concern was aroused by Saddam's inordinate ambitions and his threats to "incinerate half of Israel" and to lay his hands on all the oil on the pretext of redistributing wealth among all Arabs.

It is perfectly obvious that the United States is guided today not only by good intentions to guarantee fulfillment of the UN resolutions on Iraq. Its own interests can be perceived behind its actions. In that case should Russia identify its own interests with the West's so insistently? It is obvious that, by supporting the Western allies' military actions against Iraq, the Russian Foreign Ministry hardly worked out this question with due regard for the "internal Islamic factor."

It goes without saying that the Iraqi leaders have once again drawn their own people into a bloody adventure. Husayn's actions, his reluctance to fulfill the will of the world community, his irrepressible ambitions, and his reluctance to part with his nuclear and other military secrets pose a real threat to the cause of peace and security. But it is hardly possible to resolve all problems by military means alone. The use of force will most likely be counterproductive. This is why it is necessary to find as quickly as possible the formula which will guarantee that the world community's decisions are ensured by political, economic, and other nonviolent means.

Foreign Intelligence Delegation Ends U.S. Visit

LD1901144193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0325 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Loshchilin]

[Excerpts] Washington, 19 Jan—The first official visit to the United States by a delegation of Russian Foreign Intelligence Service executives ended on Monday. [passage omitted]

"I believe that one of the main results of the visit is that we succeeded in informing the Americans of the civilized methods of work of Russian foreign intelligence," V. Kirpichenko said in an interview with an ITAR-TASS correspondent. "We do not resort to misinformation or blackmail, we do not finance subversive organizations abroad and we do not encourage terrorism. I want to note in particular that none of the people we met here has questioned the need for intelligence services either in the United States or in Russia. Intelligence is needed if only to ensure that the government of a country has a

reliable and objective source of information. For example, it would have been impossible to sign arms control and reduction treaties without official information about our countries' arsenals backed up by intelligence information."

"We can and must cooperate with the Americans in solving such problems as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, drug smuggling, and organized crime," V. Kirpichenko said in conclusion. "And it is important that during our visit we have realized that our colleagues in the United States share our view of the need to continue such equal, partnerly cooperation."

Government Approves Plutonium Sale to U.S.

LD1801212893 Moscow ECONOMIC NEWS AGENCY in Russian 1700 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Text] The Russian Government has agreed with the proposal put forward by the Russian Ministry of Nuclear Energy (approved by the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of External Economic Ties, and the Finance Ministry) to sell 40 kilos of plutonium-238 to the United States.

This decision has been made in order to widen scientific and technological cooperation with the United States in the use of radio-isotopic sources for peaceful space research.

The Russian Ministry of Nuclear Energy, together with the interested ministries and departments, was instructed to negotiate an agreement to sell the isotope plutonium-238 to the U.S. Department of Energy.

U.S. Use of Chinese Rocket Launchers Criticized

PM2001112993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 3

[Manki Ponomarev report: "What's Sauce for the Goose..."]

[Text] Three-day Russian-U.S. consultations on the observance of the rules of the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technology have been held in Moscow. The participants in the consultations examined a number of serious issues. Of these, the problem of cryogenic (oxyhydrogen) engine deliveries from Russia to India occupied a central place.

As we know, some time ago, an agreement was reached between Moscow and Delhi to the effect that Russia would supply such engines on a commercial basis for the implementation of the Indian space program. They would be mounted on Indian space rockets and would make it possible for heavy artificial civilian satellites to be put into orbit.

However, the United States has unilaterally assessed this agreement as a violation of the rules of the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technology. In spite of the obvious facts, Washington has started to claim that the Russian cryogenic engines come under the category of "dual purpose" items, although it is clear to anyone with even a scrap of knowledge that rocket engines with liquid hydrogen as a fuel and liquid oxygen as an oxidizing agent are practically inapplicable for military purposes. Matters reached the point where the United States declared sanctions against the Russian Main Administration for the Development and Use of Space Technology for the National Economy and Scientific Research and the Indian Space Research Organization.

Naturally Russia was not about to give in to this pressure and confirmed its resolve to carry on fulfilling the contract for the supply of cryogenic engines for the Indian space program. As your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent found out, even at the recent consultations in Moscow, the American side, like in a number of other cases, continued to adhere to the policy of double standards.

We know, for example, that according to the American classification, China is in the same category of countries as India—that is, those subject to the rules of the nonproliferation of missile technologies. However, this did not prevent the United States from concluding an agreement with the PRC on the launching of nine U.S. satellites by Chinese launch vehicles (three of them have already been put into near-earth orbit). And after all, the Americans are not just putting satellites on the Chinese rockets, but also their own booster units [razgonnyye bloki], as well as an engine system [dvigatelnaya sistema] as the top stage. And they do not consider this to be a departure from the rules whose observance by others they watch over so zealously.

Washington sets itself this standard. And a completely different standard for Russia. At the same consultations in Moscow, they resolutely condemned the Russian-Indian collaboration in the sphere of technologies for civilian space research, which is being carried out on the basis of previously reached agreements. Obviously, Washington's tough stances can be explained by a desire to ensure preconditions for the monopolization by American corporations of the civilian space rocket services market, rather than by worries that India will really create intercontinental missiles.

So, what's sauce for the goose, is not sauce for the gander, so to speak. But the question is, on what basis can one side be granted the role of the goose and the other the gander?

China Denies 8 Jan Attack on Russian Tanker

LD2001130893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1200 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Spirin]

[Text] Beijing January 20—A representative of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs denied Wednesday reports in the foreign press that on January 8 a Chinese

military ship fired on the Russian tanker "Ussuriysk" in international waters in the west-Chinese Sea. "After consultations with competent departments, we were able to establish that no Russian tanker was attacked by a Chinese ship", a Chinese Foreign Affairs Department spokesman told ITAR-TASS.

It had been reported earlier that the Russian Maritime shipping line received a message from "Ussuriysk's" Captain Valentin Serikov saying that the oil-tanker, carrying 5,000 tonnes of fuel-oil to the Chinese port of Xiamen, was fired upon with grenade launchers and automatic machine guns from a high-speed boat flying the Chinese flag 80 miles from the Chinese shore off Shanghai. Fortunately, the grenade exploded 50 meters from the ship, and the guns did not cause any special damage.

After reaching the port of Xiamen, the tanker informed the Russian general consulate in Shanghai about the incident, which then made a cooresponding protest to the Chinese.

Yeltsin, Mongolian President Meet, Sign Documents

LD2001154893 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 20 Jan 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A ceremony was held in St. George's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow today for the official meeting between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Mongolian President Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat, who arrived in our country on an official visit yesterday. The national anthems of Russia and Mongolia were played. Then there was a restricted meeting between the two heads of state in St. Catherine's Hall. During the Russian-Mongolian talks which followed there was discussion of a wide range of bilateral relations and the development of all-around cooperation. Boris Yeltsin stressed that our countries have changed, the situation in the world has changed, and this is naturally reflected in Russian-Mongolian relations. They are now built on the principles of equality of rights and good neighborliness.

On completion of the talks, in the Vladimir Hall the two presidents signed a treaty on friendly relations and cooperation between the Russian Federation and Mongolia, and other documents.

Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat answered questions from journalists. And then, in the Hall of Mirrors, there was an official luncheon at which the presidents exchanged speeches. Also today, Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat laid a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier at the Kremlin wall. The eminent guest honored the memory of dead soldiers with a minute of silence.

Comment on New Treaty

OW2001125293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1218 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A friendship and collaboration treaty was signed between Russia and Mongolia in the Kremlin on Wednesday [20 January] as part of an official visit to Russia by Mongolian President Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat.

Boris Yeltsin said after the ceremony that the document reflected the "major changes which are taking place in relations between the two nations. The totalitarian past has been cast aside," he said. The Russian President said that both states were building their economies on market principles.

Yeltsin said that the treaty took into account the positive experience gained from collaboration and friendship between the two nations over many decades. The fact that not only the Russian people but also the Mongolian suffered as a result of the Stalinist repressions was also taken into account. "Therefore, in addition to the treaty, the two presidents signed a joint statement today in the Kremlin condemning totalitarian crimes," Yeltsin said.

"We have today opened new horizons for collaboration," the Russian President continued. "These are based on equal rights and mutual benefit, and the respect of each other's national interests." This, he said, marked the end of Russia's imperialist policy regarding her Asian borders.

Boris Yeltsin also stressed that the treaty would serve as the basis for a whole package of specific documents to be signed during his own official visit to Mongolia. The invitation has been received from the Mongolian President, but the dates have yet to be announced.

The Mongolian President emphasised in his speech that Russia remained the priority in Mongolia's foreign and foreign economic policy. He drew the attention of Russian business and industrial representatives to the fact that there were now no areas of the Mongolian economy which were closed to Russian participation.

Ochirbat on Thursday meets Mongolian citizens resident in the Russian Federation and visit parliament. He leaves Moscow for Mongolia at 19:00 [1600 GMT].

Yeltsin To Visit Mongolia

OW2101034193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0016 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Report by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the 20 January "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] During negotiations with Mongolian President Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat in the Kremlin on Wednesday [20 January], Boris Yeltsin accepted an invitation to

make an official visit to Mongolia. The timing of the visit will depend, said Yeltsin, on the preparation of a "complete packet of agreements" outlining specific areas of cooperation in economics, science, culture, and education. The presidents announced at a session with journalists after the meeting that a treaty on friendly relations and cooperation which had been signed that very day was to be the basis for the development of contacts between their neighbouring states.

The document, said Yeltsin, most of all expressed the fundamental changes that had taken place in relations between Russia and Mongolia. "The totalitarian past has been shed. Both states will arrange their own economic and market relationship," he noted.

The Russian leader emphasized that the agreement took into account the positive experiences in cooperation between the countries' people and their friendship, which has existed for decades. He added, however, that in the years of Stalinist repression there had been great suffering not only by Russians, but also by Mongolians. Therefore, besides the treaty, the two presidents had singed a joint announcement condemning the crime of totalitarianism.

Today, continued Yeltsin, we have opened new prospects for cooperation based on equality, mutual benefit, and respect for the national interests of both countries. This means, by his estimation, the end of Russian imperial policy toward its Asiatic neighbors. The Russian president explained that the negotiations with Ochirbat had touched upon technical questions which had arisen after the withdrawal of Russian troops from the territory of Mongolia. Also examined were the financial aspects of cooperation.

Yeltsin 'Will Certainly' Visit Japan Later This Year

OW2101010393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1717 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Boris Yeltsin will certainly go to Japan later this year on an official visit, said Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Kunadze in an Interfax interview on Wednesday.

When asked whether this visit will take place before the Big Seven meeting in Tokyo next July, Kunadze said that this would depend on the preparatory work. The postponement of the visit from last September to some time in 1993 brought about new problems in working out an agreement on a new fiscal year. Kunadze thinks that "this is a technical matter" which can be resolved by the two sides if they "succeed in working as one team".

On the other hand, he emphasized that "psychologically, the postponement led to a step backward in the Russo-Japanese relations and efforts had to be made to overcome this". He thought that these efforts were a success.

Kunadze was not specific on the kind of solution to the northern territory problem his Ministry was going to put forward. He was not willing to make predictions at this early stage. He noted with satisfaction that "both at the Tokyo conference on aid to the countries of the former Soviet Union and, later, in the exchange of messages between Boris Yeltsin and Japan's Premier Miyazawa the Japanese side was explicit in supporting democratic change in Russia".

Referendum Issues

Vice Presidential Adviser Voices Opinion

MK1901155793 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 2

[Article by Vice Presidential Adviser Andrey Fedorov under the "Carte Blanche" rubric: "April Already Close at Hand... Upcoming Referendum and How To Prepare for It"]

[Text] In Russia's political life it has of late been customary to go to the brink and try to resolve issues by fairly nontraditional means. To a considerable extent that also applies to the referendum on the fundamentals of Russia's new constitution scheduled for 11 April 1993.

While being part of the compromise reached at the Seventh Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, in essence the referendum in many respects threatens to possibly cause the destruction of that compromise. This could have a very serious effect on the development of the political situation in Russia.

I don't think that there is any need of particular proof of the obvious truism that Russia needs a new constitution, but the main question is still open—what kind of constitution, when, and at what price?

Here we come up against a whole range of problems that make us ponder the possibility of finding a constructive solution to the question of a new constitution in conditions when the political and economic crises in the country are still developing. Everyone is aware that by April the situation within the country's economy will by no means help increase the population's confidence in all the incumbent institutions of power. The considerable price hike forecast by even the most moderate economists, primarily for food, transport, and municipal services, will hardly be the right background for the creation of a fairly favorable situation for Russian citizens to express their view of the fundamental principles of the country's new state system.

It is also fairly obvious that over the coming three months the relations between Russian President B. Yeltsin and the country's parliament will be far from warm. The beginning of work on the concrete wordings of the principles to be put to the referendum will only add fuel to the fire and exert a destabilizing influence on society.

In this situation one could evidently presuppose three scenarios for the development of events and accordingly contemplate the possible consequences of each.

Option one. The discussion of the question of the fundamental principles of the new constitution is extremely stormy and it proves impossible to find the relevant compromise by mid-March. In that case it is decided to postpone the date of the referendum, until June for instance (Constitutional Commission Executive Secretary O. Rumyantsev has already spoken about this option in fairly definite terms and put forward serious arguments). The sides would gain time for a breather and to define more clearly their views and approaches within the framework of the Eighth Congress of Russian People's Deputies. However, this option does not benefit either the president or the parliament today since it does not make it possible to adequately define the basis of their strategy for future action.

Option two. The work of the president and the parliament on the principles to be put to the referendum results in so-called "parallel wordings" ultimately being included on the ballot papers. This decision which will theoretically give the voters the right to decide for themselves whether they support the particular principles submitted by the president or the parliament may in actual fact cause a total muddle. There may even be the paradoxical course of events whereby, say, of the 10 principles put to the referendum the population supports five proposed by the president and five proposed by the parliament. The result would be that this combination of "chalk and cheese" would totally rule out the possibility of any full-fledged constitution being adopted in the future for the country due to the contradictions inherent in the principles themselves. This development of events would herald nothing more than the fresh deepening of the constitutional crisis in the country.

Option three. The sides reach compromise wordings and the referendum takes place at the appointed time, but its results are deemed invalid. Primarily, that may be linked with the fact that, according to the latest polls of various sociological groups, less than 40 percent of Russian citizens today are unequivocally prepared to take part in the referendum. This event is of no interest to most of the population at the moment.

What is more, it is becoming known that the leadership of a whole series of republics within the Russian Federation and also of certain regions of Russia does not rule out the idea of a referendum not being held at all in their localities. That state of affairs would by no means help strengthen the unified Russian state.

One must be well aware that the failure of the referendum might deal a most severe blow not only to the country's president and parliament, but also to the whole system of emergent Russian democracy. It would be practically impossible to recover from this blow by civilized means.

Naturally, the following question arises: Is there a way out in the prevailing situation? In my view, there is. It is necessary for a special session of a "roundtable" to be held before parliament starts discussing the wordings to be put to the referendum, a "roundtable" led by the country's president with the participation of the leaders of republics within the Russian Federation, regions of Russia, leaders of all blocs and parties represented in parliament, and that part of the opposition without direct parliamentary representation.

Only then can there be hope of reaching a civilized compromise, capable of ensuring the constructive discussion of all questions associated with the referendum and shaping the national consensus that is so essential at present. One must be well aware that no demonstrations, rallies, or processions will be able to ensure the success of the referendum if no serious political work is carried out at the top and if the people do not see that the warring parties are prepared to reach agreement for the sake of Russia's revival, an agreement capable of opening the way to the adoption of a new Russian constitution this year.

Constituent Assembly Pushes for Referendum

OW1901170693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1445 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] If representative bodies try to block holding a referendum on the convocation of a constituent assembly in Russia, parties, movements, and members of parliament demanding it should resort to political pressure, Marina Salye, co-chairperson of the Russian Free Democratic Party said on Monday [18 January] at press conference in St. Petersburg commenting on a conference on the development of the constitutional process in Russia held in the city recently.

Telman Gdlyan, chairman of the Russian Popular Party, insisted, at the same press conference, that the April referendum be boycotted unless the formulation of the question on which it will be called satisfies the pro-constituent assembly parties.

The conference on the development of the constitutional process appealed to the Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, the President, and the Constitutional Court to convoke a constituent assembly to adopt a constitution and pass an electoral law. The conference also proposed that a mechanism for the constitution's adoption be voted on during the April 11 referendum and that a moratorium be declared on any amendments to the constitution after it is adopted.

The conference set up a public committee to run the campaign for a constituent assembly's convocation, consisting of members of nine parties and movements, including the Free Democratic Party, the Popular Party, the Russian Constituent Union, the Peasant Party, and the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms.

Trade Unions To Help Prepare 11 Apr Referendum

LD1901180093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1648 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—There is no alternative to April 11 referendum and Russian trade unions are bound to actively participate in its preparations and holding, participants in a meeting of activities of the Russian Federation of Free Trade Unions with Deputy Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Nikolay Ryabov concluded today.

"Trade unions are not indifferent to the referendum and constitutional reform, since both of them concern basic interests of the working people," Federation Chairman Igor Klochkov said, when opening the meeting.

Recalling lessons of the referendum on March 17, 1991, which failed to prevent the disintegration of the former Soviet Union, Ryabov voiced an opinion "the referendum and constitutional reform should do real good to the working people and lead to civic concord and balance of the legislative and executive powers".

Meeting participants called for further contacts with parliament heads in order to specify positions of the trade unions before the referendum. They offered to hold a roundtable meeting of trade unions, parliament members and representatives of the business community to estimate basic provisions of the new Russian Constitution.

Poltoranin Gives News Briefing on Referendum

PM2101094393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 20 Jan 93 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Mikhail Poltoranin: The Referendum May Take Two Forms"]

[Text] There are two forms the forthcoming referendum may take—it may be nonconfrontational or confrontational, Mikhail Poltoranin stated at a meeting with journalists on 18 January, emphasizing that this is not what he proposes but an analysis. A confrontational referendum would mean that the representative and executive powers would put forward their own formulations which would be included on the ballot paper as alternatives. M. Poltoranin thinks that in this case the population would show an interest in the referendum as in a political game to which people go, like to a soccer match, to see whose team will win. This type is, at the same time, fraught with negative consequences as society is at present in such a state that any spark might cause a fire. Both the president and the Supreme Soviet, M. Poltoranin thinks, will opt for a referendum of the type he describes as nonconfrontational: As far as I know, he said, B. Yeltsin and R. Khasbulatov met with their teams and discussed how to act. A joint commission will be formed to produce an agreed formulation which all the people will vote on. Representatives of various parties, movements, and independent trade unions will gather in early February to discuss the idea of the referendum.

True, a nonconfrontational referendum may, as M. Poltoranin considers, reduce interest in it as the population will argue—why do we have to participate when the people at the top have already decided.

Having emphasized that the referendum is absolutely necessary to overcome the crisis of power and to create a

new statehood for Russia, M. Poltoranin said that it is necessary to do everything so that the referendum takes place and the people cast their vote. According to him, this was exactly what the president had in mind when he said that we should not lose the referendum.

Rumyantsev Warns of Possible Cancellation

OW2001144393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1317 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Executive Secretary of the Constitutional Commission, Oleg Rumyantsev, called on people to be ready for the possible cancelation of the April 11 referendum and for the carrying out of an early election, if an agreement is not reached between various political forces in the Republic with regards to the referendum. "In that case," Rumyantsev wrote in the "RUSSIAN GAZETTE" on Wednesday, "the federal administration, in view of the threat against government unity, could put forward a proposal to call an extraordinary Congress in March-April to discuss the question of reconsidering the decisions regarding the referendum and political reform." Oleg Rumyantsev considers the fate of the referendum to hinge on agreements at three levels: between the leaders of the three branches of government, between the major Russian political coalitions, and, finally, between federal and regional administration.

If the referendum is to go ahead, then, in Rumyantsev's opinion, it should contain the text of the basis of the new Constitution of Russia, as prepared by the Constitutional Commission, which he characterizes as "nonconfrontational." The citizens will only have to answer one question: do you agree that the new Constitution should be based on these concepts? Rumyantsev expressed a negative attitude towards the suggestion of introducing 6 different questions into the referendum. He is convinced that this will result in the division of the questions into "Yeltsin's" and "Khazbulatov's", which in turn could lead to a division in society.

Deputies Call For 'Unlimited' Referendum Rights

LD2001200393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1808 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Vdovin]

[Text] Moscow January 20 TASS—The success of the efforts to stabilise the constitutional system in Russia remains in question for some influential forces in the Russian parliament which include national-patriotic and pro-communist forces, members of the parliamentary faction "Coalition of Reforms" told a news conference in Moscow on Wednesday [20 January].

They said the coalition has stepped up preparations for the upcoming nationwide referendum in Russia scheduled for April 11 which is to decide the fate of the Russian Constitution.

To this end, the coalition has offered a number of new provisions for a new constitution which would give the president the exclusive right to announce a referendum and grant unlimited rights to people to adopt decisions on all constitutional problems through referenda.

The provisions also call for private ownership of land, a two-house parliament as the supreme legislative body and a Constitutional (People's) Assembly as a state body to be set up to adopt a new constitution.

Impact of Inconclusive Referendum Results Pondered

PM2001144993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 93 First Edition p 1

[Valentin Logunov "Commentary": "Referendum Will Sweep Away Both Powers"]

[Text] The idea of holding a referendum jelled once and for all in the Russian president's mind during the dramatic days of the Seventh Congress, when his team realized that they would not manage on that occasion to send the supreme organ of power packing.

That attempt failed, but the desire persisted and (given the indomitable disposition of our president) may even have strengthened. But how was it to be done?

The idea of using a referendum to achieve those ends is in today's conditions a natural one for the president.

First and foremost, this is because there is no other available method save a strong-armed one and, despite the advice given by the "wild men" in his own entourage, he is not minded to use force, nor is it likely that he will decide to use it, aware that he will be cursed by the people.

Second, the information filtered through by his aides on the state of society and its mood have established a certainty in the president that the people, as before, adore him while loathing the congress with passion. Bearing in mind certain psychological traits of the president's personality, and they do at certain times, unfortunately, become decisive, it may be concluded that the president has been convinced of unconditional victory in the referendum. And when Boris Yeltsin is sure of something, he loses all peripheral vision.

Yet not only would it be no bad thing for the president to take a bird's-eye view of Russia, but he really ought to if he is concerned about the fate of the Russian state.

After all, the most likely outcome of the referendum is a draw between the legislative and executive branches of power. A draw could result if the population does not come out to vote or they do come out but demonstrate a lack of confidence in both. The latter is more likely, because people are sick and tired of the wrangling between the branches of powers. They regard with growing indignation both the deputies and the president

who, instead of concerting their efforts to drag the country out of the mire, indulge in squabbling.

A draw based on lack of confidence would signal a crushing defeat to both branches of power as presently constituted, since both the congress and the president would have to go, which in general could also be a productive result if there were a bit more experience of democracy in Russia, if Russia had managed to acquire a party system, if the threat of ethnic conflicts did not loom over it, and if its economy were on the upturn.

To whom will power devolve if the present president and congress go? I can only say that the people will elect them. Yes, they will indeed elect them unless some people are tempted to dispense with elections. But do the initiators of the referendum, the radical democrats, really think they will be elected?

A ruinous political struggle for Russia will be unleashed on the remnants of present power. By that time people's material hardships will most likely have increased and the muscles of the reviving party of Communists hardened. During the power vacuum every leader in the republics, krays, and oblasts will be forced to act in his own way, disregarding Russian legislation and the central organs. That background will gratify only the criminal riffraff, nationalists, and forces interested in plundering and smashing Russia. Of course Russia will not disappear, nor will the people. But why provoke upheavals where they are still avoidable?

It is beyond comprehension how the spectral images of victory conjured up in the imagination of touchy and vain ivory-tower academics from the president's team could obscure the self-evident reality that faces him. Are all leaders [vozhdi] throughout time really "dreadfully remote from the people"?

The present branches of power—executive and legislative—have quite a lot of inner resources and potential for pursuing reforms in the interests of the broad strata of the population. Everyone is aware of the need for them. Argument during the process of finding effective and correct ways and means of implementing the reforms is a perfectly normal phenomenon, and is simply essential.

But some people very much want the argument to turn into a fight. Indeed all their life is consumed by struggle.

The referendum is the invention of people incapable of creating. Headquarters, pamphlets, placards, compromising material, dirty tricks, and secret meetings are their element. Everything in which the president's entourage has been so successful. And there can be no doubt that intrigues concerning the referendum are already being woven, particularly by the "retirees" whom the president has temporarily sidelined—until better times come for them. However, the question is whether those times will come or not...

Referendum Becoming 'Issue of Power'

PM2001120993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 1

[Andrey Kolesnikov "Commentary": "Referendum Should Not Be a Subject for Political Speculation"]

[Text] The main purpose of holding a referendum, at any rate in the form in which it was originally formulated, is to break the deadlock over the constitutional process in Russia, to conclude a "social contract" with citizens, and to achieve consensus on the fundamental principles of building the state and society. But since the adoption of a new constitution is being slowed down by our legislative assembly and the presidential "party's" initiative in holding the referendum is being viewed by all his opponents as a bid for limitless power on the part of the president, the main issue of the referendum is becoming the issue of power.

It is clear that this understanding of its basic nature is conditioned by the present political situation. But it turns out that in discussing the theoretical meaning of the referendum, the politicians are forgetting the reason why it was initiated. Moreover, the Russian people are standing aloof from the disputes over the referendum. Given the high "degree" of political apathy among the majority of citizens, the forecast that the referendum could turn into a fiasco is fully justified. However, let us ponder the reason for this apathy. The people do not believe that yet again they are not being "duped" over the Constitution. Consensus on the main provisions of the Basic Law can be fully achieved in society. But most citizens intuitively sense that one concept has been substituted for another—the issue is not the Constitution but a power struggle, and the ordinary voter has no desire to get into the politicians' arguments, the burden of economic and political fatigue accumulated over the perestroyka and post-perestroyka years is too great.

The referendum should not become a subject for political speculation. But as a result it has turned out that the choice of an economic and political model for the country's development depends on what comes first—an early Congress or the referendum—or on whether the referendum will fall through or not. But it seems more than likely there will be no early Congress. The opponents of the referendum, the bulk of whom are to be found in parliament, are displaying their law-abiding nature in the quiet hope that citizens will not turn out for the referendum, and at the same time the new premier is gradually distancing himself from the president and becoming one of the legislative branch's men. Political forecasting in this sort of situation is a thankless task. However, it is quite clear that the success of the referendum (by this I do not mean its result but whether or not it will constitute a "quorum") will depend on how the questions are worded and how many pages of legalese ordinary citizens will have to decipher.

The failure of the referendum can in no way cause a social explosion, as "Russian Unity" leader Sergey

Baburin recently conjectured. Provided solely that such an explosion is not deliberately prepared, which, strictly speaking, is what the Supreme Soviet is doing; for some reason the Supreme Soviet, without having any legal justification for doing so, is linking the failure of the referendum with the president's resignation.

Political Issues

Stankevich Opposed to Constituent Assembly Idea

OW1701170693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1625 GMT 17 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The calling of a Constituent Assemby to adopt Russia's new constitution is increasing the risk of a breakdown of the Russian Federation, the Russian president's political aide Sergey Stankevich told INTERFAX.

He is sure that even if a decision has been taken on the federal level to call an Assembly, it is unlikely that Russian republics can be persuaded to arrange elections on their territory. Stankevich believes the adoption of the new basic legislation by the Congress of People's Deputies could ensure federal unity and an evolutionary way of development with minimal political risk at that.

"But if the Congress fails to adopt a constitution enabling Russia to go ahead with democratic reform, and refuses to acknowledge it has outlived itself as legislative body, said the aide, it will then be possible to revert to the idea of calling an alternative power structure such as Constituent Assembly".

Grants TV Interview

LD1901140793 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Interview with Sergey Stankevich, political adviser to President Boris Yeltsin, by program presenter Igor Pototskiy from the NEP program; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Pototskiy] The political year ended with the Congress.

[Stankevich] The Congress became, as it were, the political culmination of the year, containing all the contradictions and manifesting them very exotically, right up to our first parliamentary brawl. What can we see in the Congress, notwithstanding all its exoticism and all its affectation and lunacy? The main thing is that the possibility has been retained for continuing the reforms. There had been predictions that everything had collapsed, the reforms had been halted, Gaydar was lost and so there could be no continuation of positive changes in the economy, his team would be disbanded, we would turn backwards, we would establish the former bureaucratic control of the economy in its totality. But nothing of the kind has happened. This is now more than obvious.

Many of the people who had worked with Gaydar are still in the government, there has been no total turn backwards, and there won't be any. The prophets who had forecast disaster have got it wrong again. Elements of continuity prevail in the activity of the current government, although there are also changes in its course. [passage omitted]

[Pototskiy] In general terms, how is the adoption of fundamental economic decisions implemented? Gaydar began acting, and moreover he didn't explain anything; he just started acting. The same story in January is repeating itself, is this some kind of principle or is there some other mechanism for taking economic decisions? Is there a fundamental basis for them?

[Stankevich] No, it's not possible at present to even begin a fundamentally new economic policy. It's difficult for me to talk in terms of quantity, but I think that more than half of the decisions the government takes at present are forced decisions. They aren't decisions when some kind of very different alternatives are possible.

As concerns the underlying mechanics of taking decisions, I can't undertake to speak on this, these mechanics remain concealed. I have the impression that many things were resolved by a comparatively small kitchen cabinet, the people closest to Gaydar. But I don't have anything to back this up.

[Pototskiy] Let's go back to how the Congress was perceived. The first reaction was to Gaydar's departure. The newspapers were full of reports that that's it, the end of the reforms, the appointment of Chernomyrdin as premier is a change of policy, the first reaction was, if not shock, a lament for the lost reforms. A few days later there was the first statement by the new premier on retaining the government composition, and hopes increased incredibly that everything would stay as it was.

Then there was the question, why change the premier if everything is going to stay as it was?

[Stankevich] Gaydar has to be given his due, but we cannot fail to see what he did not do. Whatever might be said to justify Yegor Timurovich, and I think he'll admit this himself now, his approach to reform was to a greater extent technocratic, and insufficient account was taken of the social factor and the political factor.

The premier's brilliant address at the Congress was brilliant from the point of view of academic science, but in his extensive speech, without notes, with superb mastery of his economic material, there was not a single word about people, practically nothing about the social content of the reforms. Unfortunately that's so.

[Pototskiy, to camera] In the opinion of Sergey Stankevich, Gaydar had started to change over the last two months or so, a dialogue was begun with industrial

circles, things didn't get as far as agriculture, but [turns to Stankevich] when he started changing a lot in himself, and understanding the country much better, the running of which had fallen to his lot at such a critical period, at precisely that momen this hour glass ran out, that is, his historical period expired.

Does this mean that in the interests of political goals,the logic or consistency of economic measures could be upset?

[Stankevich] It might not be upset—I mean the logic or consistency of economic operations—but economic operations have to be adjusted depending on the conditions of a specific country, a specific society, our Russian society, and the pace, methods and consistency of reforms are still determined on the basis of both social and political considerations. Otherwise it's irresponsible and doomed, as has often already been the case in the history of Russia.

[Pototskiy] That is, if the stability of society requires a slowing of reforms, then the reforms have to be slowed?

[Stankevich] That's quite right. Not a single reformer can be much more radical than society, not a single reformer, because he can only implement his reforms only until, and to that degree, to which society intends to tolerat him. [passage omitted]

[Pototskiy, to camera] If we are simply talking about a compromise with the current Congress for the sake of political stability, then those who talked about the Congress victory over the president were right. Or was this a deliberate step, with calculated consequences? Break the deadlock, if economics can to some extent be sacrificed to politics, leave the Congress with an opportunity of naming the premier, turn the government into a purely executive organ and prior to the referendum gain time and an opportunity of neutralizing the parliamentary opposition. There is, of course, no definite answer, but still ... [cuts to interview with Stankevich]

[Stankevich] I think that's partly right. Very much that is currently being done is winning time, time for the reforms, for strengthening the state. Leaving Gaydar as premier, which was politically possible, would inevitably have been linked with the further aggravation of the political struggle in society, and moreover its culmination would, clearly, have occurred in early spring 1993. That is, time would have been won, but the reforms would have proceeded in an extremely unfavorable atmosphere of the most trenchant political struggle, and only three months would have been won. The change of premier gives, I think, a minimum of eight months. The premier has been appointed, the government has been renewed - it's not a new government, but a renewed one - and adjustments are being made to the course of reforms. Any renewed government, with a new premier, especially as a premier endorsed by the Congress is emerging for the first time, thereby gains a certain credit of trust, there occurs a division of responsibility for the actions of the current government because the premier has been endorsed by the Congress, and thereby, I think, a new reserve of about eight months is gained. [passage omitted]

[Pototskiy, to camera] Sergey Stankevich does not share in principle what he calls a catastrophic mentality, he thinks that economic stabilization is possible, if only for one reason ... [cuts to interview]

[Stankevich] Where Gaydar's greatest merit lies, perhaps, the value of which no one has yet realized, is that Gaydar sharply reduced the need for himself. He sharply reduced the influence of the individual on the economy. A year before he came, this was very serious - Gaydar or not Gaydar to head the government. This was of decisive importance, perhaps. After a year of his work, Gaydar or another person heading the government is also important, but far from being that important, because the reforms have acquired their own logic, their own inertia, and now the course of things are moving us towards a new economy in spite of those, perhaps, inconsistent lurches which we make.

[Pototskiy, to camera] This is perhaps the most important thing. At the same time as giving the electorate time and an opportunity to assess for themselves the actions of the government and presidential power, the concession to Congress over the choice of Premier will provide the possibility of achieving prolonged stability in current conditions.

[Stankevich] A sensible scenario for long-term political stabilization could, in my view, look like this. We could put to the referendum - if it's still going to go ahead - three main factors which, I'm convinced, will establish about 80 percent of our political spectrum.

[Pototskiy, to camera] First, the renewal of representative power which should reflect the current views of the electorate.

[Stankevich] This is immediately capable of stabilizing the political situation. And so, holding early parliamentary elections, preferably in autumn.

[Pototskiy, to camera] Second, creating a standing professional parliament.

[Stankevich] The transition to such a parliament, and clearly, the renunciation of the institution of the Congress, which has fulfilled quite a serious historical role, but from now on hands over representative power to a fully-fledged parliament.

[Pototskiy, to camera] And third, determining the range of powers of the president, parliament, and the government.

[Stankevich] The question of the powers of the main organs of state power will also be resolved simultaneously with the question of the new elections, this is fundamentally important.

[Pototskiy] The slump in production, certainly essential in some cases, is unfortunately also occurring where it is

extremely harmful. And so from an economic problem it has developed into a political problem, and as the Congress has shown, this aspect of the issue has overshadowed its economic content. Gaydar did indeed do the main thing: he didn't leave any road back. Any manipulations with the reforms might be unpleasant or dangerous, but no longer lethal. And if the current government, even to the detrmiment of everything else, manages to remove this political problem of the slump, that's wonderful. Presidential power will have an opportunity of preparing the ground for a fundamentally new correlation of forces.

[Stankevich] I think the picture will thereby be changed. The new government, or rather the renewed government, will, it seems to me, be able at least to slow the pace of the slump, and then break the tendency, which is very important—it's one thing to have elections against the backdrop of a slump, and another thing against the backdrop of at least relative stabilisation—and we shall at the same time carefully prepare, financially, organizationally, and politically, this most important political act, the elections.

Coalition Says National Salvation Front Actions Unlawful

OW1801184693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1510 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Representatives of the Parliamentary Reform Coalition have formally appealed to the chairman of the RF [Russian Federation] Constitutional Court, informing him that on January 15 a number of picket members, who were flaunting a "National Salvation Front" streamer, blocked all the entrances to the RF Supreme Council building, and resorted to "kicks and insults, trying to obstruct the entry into the parliament building of people's deputies, employees of the parliamentary offices, and journalists".

In their appeal to Valeriy Zorkin, chairman of the RF Supreme Court, the deputies maintain that "the violence by the National Salvation Front activists, similar to that its leaders resorted to during the events near the "Ostankino" TV Center last summer, is characterizing the NSF as an unlawful, extremist-colored organization".

The authors of the appeal request that it be attached to the NSF case at the Constitutional Court which is to conclude whether the RF President's edict, regarding the dissolution of the Organizing Committee of the National Salvation Front, is constitutional.

Civic Union Sees Domestic Situation as Tense

OW1601172793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1613 GMT 16 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The political consultative council of Russia's Civic Union has decided to call the Union's next convention on February 28.

The Chairman of the Union's Executive Committee Vasiliy Lipitskiy has told newsmen political tension is running so high as to require a convention. Confrontation is mounting between the country's different political forces and neither the legislative nor the executive branch of power is working to meet the conditions of last month's compromise.

The Civic Union's leader Nikolay Travkin has emphasized that choices for Russia's Defense, Security, Internal Affairs and Foreign Ministers have yet to be presented to the Parliament, constitutional amendments are waiting to be enforced and attempts are being made to monopolize the media.

Besides, said Travkin, attempts were being made to twist the idea of the forthcoming nationwide referendum. The referendum had not been planned as a test of force between the President and the Congress of People's Deputies. It had been designed to ascertain the population's stand on the country's political makeup. In Travkin's view, the team of presidential aides and advisers was emerging as an unconstitutional fourth branch of national power. Travkin felt the President's men would try to conduct the referendum so as to emerge as Russia's only branch of power.

All the members of the Union's political council, except Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy, attended the news conference. Rutskoy could not attend for health reasons.

Says President Not Observing Compromise

LD1601132793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1309 GMT 16 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow January 16 TASS —"The president and his entourage do not observe the letter and spirit of the compromse agreement, worked out by the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies, between the executive and legislative branches of power" is how the Political Council of the Civic Union assessed the situation in Russia at its session on Saturday [16 January].

Vasiliy Lipitsiky, one of the leaders of the Civic Union, is of the opinion that a breach of the achieved compromise manifests itself primarily in the issue concerning the forthcoming April referendum on the fundamentals of the constitutional system.

Lipitskiy believes that "the need for a triumph of the advocates of a presidential set-up of the republic and the dissolution of Congress is being proclaimed again, whereas the referendum was contemplated for taking counsel with the people about the principles of a state set-up of Russia, not for the sake of finding out who is stronger".

Russian Democratic Party Leader Nikolay Travkin believes that confrontational relationship between the two branches of power is also observed in their approach to personnel appointments.

Travkin said "the president's entourage—the chairman of the Federal Information Centre, advisers, and representatives of the president at the local level—constitute an unconstitutional authority and lay claim to absolute power". The Democratic Party leader deemed it necessary to caution the president about the danger of the ambitions of his immediate entourage.

As far as the economic situation in Russia is concerned, Civic Union leaders Arkadiy Volskiy, Aleksandr Vladislavlev and Nikolay Travkin expressed support for Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin.

In so doing, Volskiy, president of the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Russia, drew attention to the need to stimulate the investment of private capital in the Russian economy. He regards the protection of investors' interests with the aid of a federal insurance fund, which is being established, as a means to attain this end.

Holds Council Meeting

MK1901154793 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 93 pp 1,3

[Yevgeniy Krasnikov report: "'Civic Union' Still Has Faith in Premier. And Seems To Have Already Lost Faith in the President"]

[Text] The unusually forthright statements from the president's closest comrades in arms (Gennadiy Burbulis in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI and Mikhail Poltoranin in L'UNITA) seem to have finally gotten through to even the most phlegmatic leaders of "Civic Union." It is the overall opinion of observers who attended the 16 January session of the "Civic Union" Political Consultative Council that the leaders of Russian centrism have toughened their stance and that hopes of being able to make Yeltsin change his mind on some matters have appreciably diminished.

"What do you think of the fact that Mikhail Poltoranin described you as an unsubstantial windbag [mylnyy puzyr]?" Arkadiy Volskiy was asked at the press conference by a journalist. "Well, there are various kinds of bag. There are, of course, windbags, but there are also scumbags and shitbags [Yest, konechno, mylnyye. A yeshe byvayut zhelchnyye i mochevyye]," Russia's chief industrialist replied.

The main result of the "Civic Union" council session should perhaps be said to be the decision to start work on a comprehensive political and economic program for the centrist bloc, a program that may in the near future take the form of an election platform.

Sergey Rogov, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute, submitted the "Civic Union" draft foreign-policy program to the Political Council 16 January. In his report he touched on such questions as the problem of withdrawing troops from the former Union republics, the possibility of sanctions against those CIS countries that violate the rights of the Russian-speaking population, and the possibility of introducing dual citizenship.

The second item on the agenda was the discussion of the political situation that has taken shape in the country and the adoption of a special statement in this connection. "Civic Union" leaders think that the "radical forces" that make up the president's immediate entourage are wrecking the compromise reached at the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies. Evidence of this is the creation of the Federal Information Center which is establishing control over the mass media, the recent personnel changes, and the attempt to change the essence of the constitutional referendum by raising the question of "Who will win?"

Considering Boris Yeltsin's recent meeting with "Democratic Choice" leaders, it seems extremely indicative that the leadership of "Civic Union" can hardly expect in the current conditions to enter into direct contact with the president shortly.

On the other hand, the Russian centrists' relations with the new premier are developing more favorably. Although, as Nikolay Travkin, leader of the "Democratic Party of Russia [DPR]," said, the old core has still survived in the current cabinet and must be removed; however the centrists are so far quite amicable toward Viktor Chernomyrdin personally. "I hope that Chernomyrdin's actions will prove that his is not a puppet government. I think that Chernomyrdin's government will nonetheless prove better than the Yeltsin-Gaydar government," Travkin said. Of course, at the moment these are just the opening gambits. But the possibility of "Civic Union" leaders having a personal meeting with the premier (unlike the president) is quite feasible. At any rate, Chernomyrdin has been informed that this is what the centrists intend, and he seems quite ready to agree to meet with them.

The attitude toward April's upcoming constitutional referendum, something that may herald the establishment of a presidential dictatorship, was virtually the most acute issue discussed by the "Civic Union" Political Council. The ardent forthright Nikolay Travkin, as always, proposed the simplest way out of the current situation: He suggested not holding a referendum, but adopting a new Constitution in March at the congress of people's deputies.

In response another DPR member, Ilya Roytman, remarked to his leader that he himself had taken part in the talks at the Congress that resulted in the agreement for the new constitution to be adopted via the April referendum. "What is more, can you guarantee that the Congress will muster the requisite two-thirds vote to adopt a constitution," Roytman asked Travkin. The

latter shrugged his shoulders and the question was temporarily shelved. It was decided that "Civic Union" would determine its final position on the referendum at its forum in February.

For the time being the centrists are obviously extremely preoccupied with seeking new political allies and with forming structures whereby they can exert effective influence on the Russian authorities. The political statement adopted at the "Civic Union" Council session once again contained a demand for the "convocation of a 'roundtable' involving political parties, movements, and social groups."

At the moment the president is categorically refusing to come to a "roundtable" for negotiations. That is no accident. Ahead of the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies Gennadiy Burbulis handed him a memorandum that cited the experience of countries in East Europe viewing the idea of a "roundtable" as a symptom of instability and the right way to effect a change of authority.

Gennadiy Burbulis may be quite right this time. But that notwithstanding (or, more accurately, precisely for that reason) "roundtables" have already begun to meet in Russia. Last week one was held by the constitutional commission, then the Constitutional Court, and 16 January Ruslan Khasbulatov and Viktor Chernomyrdin signed a joint directive for a "roundtable" to be set up as a permanent institution with expert groups.

New Russia Bloc Leaders Set Out Policy

LD1501232493

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1450 GMT on 15 January in a 15-minute program in its "Gentlemen-Comrades" series features the leaders of the New Russia bloc, who are introduced as follows: Telman Gdlyan, co-chairman of the Russian People's Party; Yuriy Chernichenko, chairman of the Russian Peasants Party; and Vladimir Filin, chairman of the Russian Social Liberal Party.

The Russian People's Party is described as having been registered in September 1991, and having 7,000 members. Its main principles are freedom, security, and prosperity. The Russian Peasants Party is described as having been registered April 1992, and having 14,000 members. Its main slogan is: "Free labor on your own land." The Russian Social Liberal Party was formed in January 1992, and has approximately 1,500 members. Party leaders support a combination of the ideals of liberalism and social support.

Introducing the bloc, Gdlyan says that New Russia distances itself from Civic Union, and former communist and rightist factions. he says that New Russia includes all Russian political views. He lists the constituent parties, saying that they joined forces to promote democracy in Russia by competing on equal terms with rightist blocs in the 1993 elections. Chernichenko complains that land is still in the hands of local soviets, and that no reform in this area has yet taken place. He continues: "The Peasants Party does not want the referendum on the land —which 2.5 million of you signed—to be forgotten, and wants a change in ownership of the land." He continues: "The Peasants Party supports the private farming movement. At the moment we have about 180,000 farmers in this country. That means about 1 million people occupied in the free cultivation of the land. When there are 1 million farmers, we will be speaking a completely different language, and everyone will understand what the Russian Peasants Party was doing."

Filin describes hyperinflation and unemployment as the two main problems facing the country. The answer, he says, lies in the development of medium- and low-level entrepreneurship, and continued: "We think that setting up medium- and low-level entrepreneurs at this point will allow us to eliminate the unemployment that is approaching. That is the first thing. Second, it will remove this sociopolitical tension, because if someone is well provided for they won't go to meetings, they won't strike, they'll do something concrete." Filin goes on to stress the importance of ethnic and economic stability in attracting foreign investment. Turning to the constitutional crisis, Filin calls for a new law on parties and social organizations to replace those enacted by the former Union, and a professional parliament capable of adopting constructive laws from the point of view of reform. Chernichenko expresses dissatisfaction with Yeltsin's attitude to political parties, and concludes: "Now we are ready, so to speak, to support him, but there are all sorts of different buts here."

Filin expresses the bloc's unconditional support for the upcoming referendum on 11 April. In conclusion, Gdlyan calls for a new constituent assembly, which would carry out the following four tasks: "First, adopt a constitution, a basic law for the country which from which all the other laws will spring. Second, adopt a law on parties. Third, adopt a law on elections. Finally, set a time for holding general elections in Russia. The constituent assembly would perform all these functions, and would dissolve itself; new elections would be held, a new distribution of political forces would arrive, and the party, the bloc which basically was able to win the sympathy of the majority of Russians, would lead for the next five years and carry the responsibility for everything that happens."

Council Submits Plan To Fulfill Congress Resolutions

OW1901184793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1747 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Tuesday [19 January], the Russian Council of Ministers sent a plan of action, to fulfill the resolutions of the 7th Congress of the People's Deputies "On process of economic reform in the Russian Federation", to the Supreme Soviet.

The document contains six major sections and is to be realized within the next six months. According to the government's resolution, the Russian Vice Premiers are responsible for controlling the fulfillment of the Congress' resolutions.

INTERFAX presents the major items of the plan and the terms of their realization:

Social bloc: Preparation of a program to solve the problems of refugees and settlers from the former USSR republics (March), preparation of a program to index monetary deposits of the population (March), increasing of percent tariffs on saving deposits to a level which would ensure protection from inflation (February).

Agrarian bloc: It is the government's resolution to render financial assistance to enterprises in the agrarian-industrial complex during the winter-spring period of 1993. To provide them with fuel, equipment, mineral fertilizers in the necessary volume (February), proposals to free incomes of industrial enterprises of taxes channeled for the development of the agrarian-industrial complex enterprises (February), consideration of the issue to compensate debt to the agricultural producers caused by the indexation of prices for 1992, bearing inflation in mind (February).

Industrial bloc: State support of vital industries and goods producers (February), resolution of the Russian government on the order of basic funds' indexation (February- March), development of measures to stimulate crediting of investment activity (February), preparing a proposal to repay domestic currency debt (January).

Financial bloc: development of a draft resolution of the Supreme Soviet "On the state's monopoly of the production and sale of alcohol" (January), strengthening of control over purpose oriented beneficial credits (February).

Foreign economic bloc: development of a Federal Program's Draft to stimulate export (February), measures aimed to ban usage of foreign currency on the territory of the Russian Federation (February).

Improving relations with the CIS countries: preparation of a government resolution to organize negotiations with the CIS countries on trade-economic and monetary-credit relations for 1994 (June).

Yeltsin Signs Decree on Law-Making Procedures

LD2001215193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2045 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] Moscow January 20 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin signed a decree on January 14 on the procedure of law-making by central federal executive bodies and the president's administration, the Press Service of the Russian president reported on Wednesday [20 January].

The decree is aimed at strengthening a legal basis for contacts between the executive and the legislative bodies of power, regulating the activities of central executive bodies and the president's administration to ensure legislative prerogatives of the Russian president.

The decree outlines in detail the procedure of preparation of draft bills and legislative proposals submitted by the president to the parliament of the Russian Federation, and determines agencies entitled to prepare draft laws and proposals for the president, establishes the order of appointing official representatives of the president while discussing documents submitted by the Russian president at the Russian parliament.

Draft laws and proposals on the use by the president of the right of the legislative initiative are submitted to him by the government, the Security Council, the Council of Heads of Republics and the president's State Department for Legal Issues.

Yeltsin Decree on State TV, Radio Company

LD1901221993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin issued a decree today on giving the All-Russia State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company the status of a state company. According to a report from the president's press service, the document is aimed at preserving a single nationwide information space and pursuing a unified scientific and technical policy in television and radio. In accordance with the decree, the All-Russia Television and Radio Company represents the country's interests in international television and radio organizations and carries out its activity in close cooperation with the bodies of legislative and executive power of Russia.

Besides this, the decree gives the company complete control over broadcasting on the fourth television channel. It is envisaged that a cycle of programs should be created which are devoted to the problems of entrepreneurship, land reform, privatization, conversion, the tax system, and banking and insurance activity.

Yeltsin Sends Privatization Bill to Parliament

LD1901195693 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jan 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] President Yeltsin today sent to the Russian Parliament a draft state program for the privatization of state and municipal enterprises for 1993. A bill was sent on privatization vouchers was also sent.

The average value of vouchers traded on the Russian commodity and raw material exchange has fallen to about 5,000 rubles [R]. Last week it rose to nearly R6,000. Such fluctuations are linked to the fact that a bill has been submitted for examination by the Russian Supreme Soviet on the priority of workforces and municipal enterprises in choosing forms of privatization.

According to the managing director of the exchange, the government is again changing the rules during the game.

Yeltsin's 1992 Popularity Ratings Cited

MK1801132193 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 16 Jan 93 pp 1-2

[Professor Boris Grushin "NG-VP Poll": "When Did Russian Leaders of Opinion Love Their President? In 1992 Boris Yeltsin Was Most Popular During Dacha Season—April-September"]

[Text] Throughout last year the VP Agency put the same two questions every month to representatives of the Russian establishment, people who can quite justifiably be considered as voicing and forming public opinion in the country—members of parliament, leaders of the executive, leaders of political parties, captains of industry, prominent businessmen, leading military chiefs, leaders of the press, and representatives of the creative intelligentsia:

1. Which of the former Soviet Union's politicians has succeeded in exerting the greatest influence on the course of events in Russia?

2. What kind of influence—undoubtedly positive, mostly positive, mostly negative, or undoubtedly negative?

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA received the results of the polls from VP every month and published them regularly, and as the reader may remember, the picture changed several times over the year, sometimes very considerably. Suffice it to say that at the very beginning of 1992 the leaders of opinion considered the most influential figure in the country's life to be not a Russian citizen but a "foreigner"—Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk. Then, in October, [Kazakhstan President] N. Nazarbayev was all but deemed to play that role. However, during all the other months that the Russian president held first place and was way ahead of the competition, his position was nonetheless most frequently described as unstable and constantly changed from poll to poll.

Graph of Yeltsin's Successes and Failures

Today certain results can be summed up in this respect, and these results can maybe be presented in very general terms—in relation to the first question—using the graph published below.

Assessments of B.N. Yeltsin as the Political Figure Exerting the Greatest Influence on Russian Life in 1992 [figures in following table represent percentage of total number of respondents]

January	23
February	27
March	42
April	61
May	54
June	64
July	57
August	53
September	46
October	33
November	49
December	51

Another result is presented in the table of assessments of the Russian president's influence on the course of events in the country. When indicating the number of people who took a fairly positive or negative view of Yeltsin's activity, in its monthly reports VP usually expressed this figure as a percentage of the number of respondents who described Yeltsin as the most influential figure of the month. For instance, in January these people represented 23 percent of the total number of respondents, and 70 and 23 percent of them voiced a positive and negative opinion respectively of the president (while 7 percent were don't-knows). Now, in order to gain an idea of the true movement of events over the year, the question has to be put differently: How many people were there in a particular month among the leaders of opinion who voiced a positive opinion of the Russian president's activity, and how many voiced a negative opinion (I am referring to the fact that the overwhelming majority of the others did not acknowledge his influence on the course of events in the country). These results are shown in the second table below.

Assessments of B.N. Yeltsin's Influence on Russian Life in 1992 (as a percentage of the total number of respondents, not counting don't-knows)

	Positive Influence	Negative Influence
January	16	-5
February	20	-5
March	35	-5
April	51	-7
May	42	-9
June	51	-10
July	45	-11
August	40	-10
September	35	-9
October	19	-13
November	40	-7
December	36	-14

Of course, it is the task of our society's historians, professional political scientists, and journalists to provide concrete interpretation of the first and second figures (which are, incidentally, closely linked with one another). It is they who must explain the reasons for the Russian president's peaks and troughs in the eyes of the country's political, administrative, and creative elite, reveal the secret of Yeltsin's maximum success last

April- June, review the precise circumstances of his greatest lack of success in October, etc. From the sociological viewpoint accordingly, the main point of the information received boils down, in essence, to two things:

first, as already noted, the overall, constant instability of opinion regarding the president, behind which clearly lies the constant instability of his objective position;

second, (for all the changeability of the picture) the prevailing critical attitude toward the president on the part of the Russian elite as a whole (the increase in the recognition of his importance that came at the very end of the year should not mislead you here, since October and December mark the year's highest negative assessments of this activity).

Groups of Support and Criticism

Comparison of the combined monthly statements about B.N. Yeltsin by various groups of respondents makes it possible to speak of four explicit attitudes toward the president on the part of the Russian elite: 1) supreme solidarity with him; 2) moderate solidarity; 3) heightened criticism of him; 4) active rejection of his activity.

The first of the above attitudes was manifested most distinctly by leaders of the executive: Since March they have only on two occasions (at the very end of the year) surrendered their first place for positive assessments of the president's activity, moreover during the period March-August there was not a single man among them who thought that Yeltsin was adversely affecting the course of events in the country.

In their wake the leaders of nonstate business—private, joint-stock, and joint enterprises and commercial banks—can be included in this group, albeit with somewhat lesser justification: For the most part (from this viewpoint) they held "second place"; it was they who gave the highest positive assessments of Yeltsin's activity in November and December.

The second attitude toward the president was manifested fairly constantly by four groups of leaders of opinion—representatives of the creative intelligentsia, military chiefs, Supreme Soviet deputies, and leaders of the mass media; while the third attitude was manifested equally by leaders of political parties of noncommunist orientation and leaders of enterprises in the state sector.

The fourth attitude was manifested by leaders of parties of a communist orientation pure and simple. Over the year their negative views of Yeltsin steadily exceeded—as a rule, many times over—their positive statements about the president. In December there was no one at all among respondents in this group who thought that the president exerted a positive influence on the course of events in the country.

Closest Rivals and Outsiders

As already mentioned, there were effectively only two politicians who constituted real rivals for the Russian president in the polls—Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk (who was twice in January and February declared by the leaders of opinion to hold the No. 1 spot in their answers to the first question) and Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev (who held the No. 2 spot on four occasions in the September-December period and never dropped below third place throughout the year).

As for politicians from Russia itself, barring the occasions when [then Acting Prime Minister] Ye. Gaydar once rose to second place (in July) and when he twice tied with N. Nazarbayev for 3d-4th place (in May-June), they clearly had no cause to brag. To reflect this situation the VP Agency frequently used the same headline in its monthly reports: "Boris Yeltsin Ahead, Once Again No One Behind...."

In the most general terms the political capital won by our national leaders as reflected in the polls is presented in the table below.

Maximum Success Attained by Russian Politicians in Responses Given by Leaders of Opinion to the Question: "Which Politician Has Had the Greatest Influence on the Course of Events in Russia?"

	Months	Percentage of Total Number of Respondents
G. Burbulis	November, December	2
Ye. Gaydar	June, July, December	5
A. Rutskoy	August	4
R. Khasbulatov	December	7

Economic Issues

Yeltsin Setting Up 'His Own' Bank

PM2001094193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 93 p 2

[Aleksandr Shinkin report incorporating comments by People's Deputy Ivan Shashviashvili: "The President's Pocket Bank, or Who Will Finance the Referendum"]

[Text] The Russian president's directive No. 872 dated 30 December 1992 on establishing a Russian Bank for Reconstruction and Development has gone unnoticed. As if it were a routine matter, provided, of course, we forget about existing laws. People's Deputy Ivan Shashviashvili commented as follows on this decree by Yeltsin:

"Let us be more specific: All Russian banks except the Central Bank are commercial in the eyes of the law. They operate on the basis of licenses issued to them by the

Central Bank, which is independent of the administrative and executive organs of state power. So why is the president promulgating a decree establishing a commercial organization that bypasses the laws? And why is he assigning—again to the government—the task of approving the personnel of the organizing committee of the Russian Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its draft documents of incorporation?

"The matter does not end with these questions. The president is appointing someone called V. Dmitriyev to the post of chairman of the organizing committee for setting up the Russian Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Let us be clear who he is. If he is a state functionary, then this again is at odds with the law, which clearly states that such people are forbidden to participate in the administrative organs of banks. But if the president does not consider him a state functionary, Boris Yeltsin has embarked on a new practice of appointing directors of commercial structures. He has thereby considerably broadened the circle of his nomenklatura. But the main point is that he can basically run the bank himself. If this is so, it is clear why the president is entrusting the material and technical backup of the organizing committee for establishing this commercial institution to his own government apparatus.

"However, this presidential directive is not merely indicative of his disregard for the law. More than this, it indicates the fact that Boris Yeltsin is fully equipped and ready for a skirmish with the legislative power. He is establishing 'his own' bank which, among other things, will directly finance the president's nascent party, his propaganda campaigns, and in particular the upcoming referendum in April. Briefly, a financial base is being created for stepping up the activity of those forces which currently support the establishment of a so-called presidential republic."

Yeltsin Directive Establishes Social-Production Department

OW1801210993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1706 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] By directive of President Boris Yeltsin, the Chief Social-Production Department (GSPU) has been established on the basis of the economic department of his administration. The head of the new structure, which, according to the document, can only be reorganized or liquidated by the head of state, will be responsible for material-technical, financial, and general assurance of the activity of the presidential administration and the government staff, among other matters. In particular, the distribution of "available living space," the "establishment of necessary conditions for rest at departmental sanatoria, rest homes, and pensions," and the "carrying out of foreign economic activity."

As an independent organization and a legal entity, the department has the right to establish and activate commercial ties with foreign firms and companies, to close contracts for import-export operations, render export services (rent and hotel arrangements), to establish subsidiary enterprises, organizations, and joint ventures within the Russian Federation, to obtain and sell hard currency at auction on currency exchanges. The hard-currency powers of the department are directed at "the manufacturing and social needs of the department."

The property and assets of the GSPU are to be entirely at its disposal. The property rights of subsidiary enterprises, operations, and organizations may be transferred to the organizations or to individuals only with the permission of the president. The buildings, equipment, and fixed and moveable assets of the enterprises, operations, and organizations subordinate to the GSPU are federal property, and belong to the high organs of state power and the leadership of Russia, and are not subject to denationalization or privatization, including renting with the right to buy or in any other form except in the event of corresponding decisions by the president of the Russian Federation.

Forty-eight such institutions are subsumed under Yeltsin's directive; they will provide the primary financing for the activity of the GSPU. These include: the administration of the government buildings in the Kremlin, the Kremlin State Palace (formerly the Kremlin Palace of Congresses), two food conglomerates on the Old Square in the Kremlin, the Zolotoe Koltso and President-Otel hotels in Moscow, the building enterprise in the Krasnogor region of the Moscow suburbs, the self-supporting base of material and technical support in the capital, two printers in Moscow, a housewares store, a furniture factory, three car depots, an information and computer center, a clinical hospital, a medical clinic, two pharmacies, fifteen sanatoria, rest homes, pensions, and health complexes, the agro-industrial conglomerate in the Moscow region, and several children's and preschoolers' institutions.

In accordance with the directive, the president has named Feodor Morshchakov to lead the GSPU "with undivided authority."

Shumeyko on Reforms, Consolidation of Presidential Power

LD1501205293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1450 GMT 15 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Gvritishviliy]

[Text] Moscow January 15 TASS—"The government of Viktor Chernomyrdin continues 'Gaydar reforms' and there will be no essential changes in the economic policy of the new Cabinet of Ministers," First Vice Premier

Vladimir Shumeyko told correspondents at the international press center here today.

He stressed the new team was "formed by the president and subordinated to his will and the policy of reform he is pursuing". At the same time, Shumeyko noted "the Gaydar government successfully ruined the economic system of socialism, and the Chernomyrdin government must provide for the stabilization and building of a new economy".

The official called for consolidation of the presidential power in Russia, and said society is not ready for a parliamentary form of rule.

Speaking on Western credits, Shumeyko stressed it would be most real to receive a three-five year delay in payment of foreign debt of the former Soviet Union. The money could be used for support of Russian economic reforms.

Defends Chernomyrdin Team

LD1601201793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jan 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Vladimir Shumeyko [first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers] met with the management and journalists of the Russian TV and Radio Company. The meeting was arranged because of the fact that we, as journalists, have a poor understanding of the processes taking place in the economy. Vladimir Filippovich said the words: We, the Chernomyrdin team, more than once during the meeting. [Video shows Shumeyko in a conference room addressing reporters, including a number of RTV presenters, and answering their questions.]

[Correspondent Tumanova] [Prime Minister] Chernomyrdin is of course tougher than Gaydar, the first deputy chairman noted. But their views on implementing the reforms and those of members of the government coincide, so it remains a team of like-minded people. Nothing was said against Gaydar—his government's job was to break up the old system, and they broke it up ably.

[Begin Shumeyko video recording] I would depict that economic system, of a centralized economy, as a house of cards. You remember, when you have cards you try to build this little house. And there is this game: You pull out a card in such a way that the rest don't collapse. That is what the Gaydar team was doing: It was pulling out from that system those unnecessary parts which would later prevent us from building a market. [end recording]

The demolition team has been replaced, in Shumeyko's opinion, by a government of stabilization which intends to halt the fall in output and make it possible for enterprises to begin making profits. Unlike the previous team, which informed the press of its activities as a rule in general terms, this team intends to tell the mass media in detail about all the possible consequences of its decisions, and also of any personnel changes in the new government, which are not ruled out.

Chernomyrdin Chairs Presidium Session on Economic Reform

OW2001135393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1320 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The presidium of the government of the Russian Federation, chaired by Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, opened its session on Wednesday [20 January] in the Kremlin. An INTERFAX correspondent was informed at the press center of the Council of Ministers that first on the session's agenda were reports by the ministers and heads of state committees responsible for government economic policy regarding the basic goals for 1993 of the departments they head.

Among them are Minister of the Economy Andrey Nechayev, Finance Minister Vasiliy Barchuk, and Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Sergey Glazev.

Also on the agenda are reports by Vice Premiers Boris Fedorov and Anatoliy Chubays on the accomplishing of the plan for the deepening of economic reform and urgent measures in financial and economic policy.

Vice-Premier, Minister of Higher Education and Technical Policy Boris Saltykov will present the members of the presidium with information on the mechanism for establishing and realizing state educational and technical policy.

The presidium also intends to consider a draft of the special federal program for development of a sanitation and epidemiological service in 1993-95; and to discuss the program for the social support of disabled people, written up by the Russian Ministry of Social Support of the Population.

Interviewed on Reform Program

LD2001140693 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 20 Jan 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Prime Minister] Viktor Chernomyrdin is chairing a meeting of the Russian Council of Ministers Presidium in the Kremlin today. Among the most important items on the agenda is a discussion of the progress in implementing the measures for deepening the economic reform program, and immediate measures in financial and economic policy. [Video cuts to meeting in progress.]

[Unidentified correspondent] It's amazing but it's a fact: Last year the Russian Government fulfilled its own program for lifting the country's economy out of crisis by only 55 percent. And maybe this very fact proved

sufficient for Viktor Chernomyrdin to describe the work of ministries and departments as unsatisfactory.

At today's meeting of the government Presidium, Vice Premiers Anatoliy Chubays and Boris Fedorov proposed immediate measures for lifting the economy out of a state of breakdown. According to the plan, without changing the course toward reforms, the government needs to adopt a package of urgent measures to stabilize the ruble, create priorities in industry and agriculture, and elaborate a more precise social policy. [Video cuts to show correspondent's interview with Chernomyrdin.]

[Correspondent] Viktor Stepanovich, the main question of concern to the inhabitants of the whole of our country is probably whether the government will cope with inflation, with the rise in prices, and today's discussion showed that the measures will still be resolute.

[Chernomyrdin] Well, it is our task today to take measures, in whatever form they are clothed. Of course, we need resolute measures today. The question that we have just discussed is, I believe, the root question, the main question, in essence what is at issue is the reforms, continuing the reforms, in what terms, in what direction they should proceed, not in the sense of reviewing or revoking, but in the sense of concrete actions, what we have to do. There must be discipline, of course. Without this, especially in our country, you cannot work. That is clear. And so we will be taking (?measures) now.

Ministers Discuss Ways To Stabilize Industry

OW1801173593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1508 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian Finance Minister Vassily Barchuk has announced that 350-400 Bn. [billion] rubles of extra credit is to be granted to industrial enterprises in 1993, for special purposes within the framework of a state assistance scheme. In a speech at a meeting organised by the parliamentary industry and energy committee to discuss the 1993 budget, the minister said that reduced VAT [value added tax] and tax on profit were also part of the state assistance scheme. He pointed out that due to this alone, enterprises gained a total of 670 Bn. rubles this year.

Barchuk stressed that around 113 Bn. rubles would be set aside for conversion, and another 300 bn. as credit for conversion enterprises.

The minister said that the frequent indexation of enterprises' assets would be necessary. If this was not done, he said, their economic situation would not improve.

He also pointed out that managers were, as yet, "doing little to attract shareholders."

Economics Minister Andrey Nechayev in his speech at the meeting emphasised that investments in industry must for the main part be transfered to a returnable and credit basis. He was in favour of the recurrent indexation of enterprises' depreciation deductions with measures to prevent them from putting these to uses other than for developing manufacturing.

Regarding the difficulties faced by the coal industry, Nechayev pointed out that 8% of coal mines were currently operating without subsidy, and that 13% had "practically no chance of survival."

Belitskiy Commentary on Economic Figures

LD1801205393

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English at 1910 GMT on 18 January broadcasts a commentary by Boris Belitskiy on the preliminary figures on the performance of the Russian economy during 1992.

In the commentary Boris Belitskiy notes the following: In demographic terms 1992 was the most unfavorable year for Russia since the Second World War: "For the first time the population actually declined by more than 70,000 people, or 0.1 percent of the population. For every 11 births per 1,000 people, there were 12 deaths. Worse still this unfavorable trend is expected to continue this year."

Belitskiy also notes that the only industry that did relatively well was fuel and power. The gas industry maintained production at practically the previous year's level, whilst coal production dropped by four percent, oil production by 15 percent, and electricity production by five percent. The comparatively favorable performance of these industries was largely due to considerable government support.

In contrast Belitskiy notes the negative effect of reduced investments in the iron and steel and engineering industries: The drop in production of metal cutting tools, for example, was "as big as 25 percent".

Belitskiy said that the overall decline in industrial production in 1992 is estimated at 19 percent and although the grain harvest was 20 percent bigger than the previous year the agrarian reform has so far not been able to pull agriculture out of its crisis, with livestock farming particularly badly hit.

Belitskiy says: "In December 1992 the general retail price index was 26 times higher than at the same time of the previous year. Since this is more than double the increase in incomes, living standards dropped very substantially", adding that among retired people "over 80 percent of their pensions is swallowed by food."

In conclusion he notes that the progress of privatization is an encouraging factor: "During the month of November the number of privatized businesses in Russia jumped by 13 percent."

Finance Minister on 1993 Budget Issues

LD1901142793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1254 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow January 19 TASS—Already in March, in all probability, the Russian Government will have to decide on an increase in the size of minimum wage in the budget-maintained sector, Russian Finance Minister Vasiliy Barchuk said at the parliamentary hearings in the Russian White House here on Tuesday [19 January]. The hearings deal with the subject "the 1993 budgets of national-state and administrative-territorial entities".

This step of the government, the minister said, will be prompted by none other than the parliament's recent decision to raise the minimum size of old-age pensions up to 4,225 roubles from February 1 as against the still existing amount of 2,250 roubles.

The Finance Ministry's estimates are that the already huge federal budget deficit may grow up to 1,100,000 million roubles, which will be above the five per cent of GNP mark set by the memorandum of the International Monetary Fund.

Barchuk urged the deputies to proceed from the actual situation concerning the state budget and reconsider the parliament's decision on an added value tax, increasing it up to at least 22 per cent. He believes, and this is, probably the opinion of the government, payment for land should continuously increase.

The finance minister gave some preliminary data on budget performance in national-state and administrative-territorial entities over 1992.

"One can confidently draw a conclusion that the budgets of all 89 territories of the Russian Federation exceeded their revenue targets. Our estimates are that revenue will exceed expenditures by 350-380 billion roubles," Barchuk said.

A different picture can be seen as regards the federal consolidated budget where a considerable shortfall of revenue is observed, the minister remarked.

Budget Deficit of Subjects Likely To Be Set Arbitrarily

OW1901222893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1957 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The budgets of 54 out of 89 subjects of the Russian Federation run deficits which have been set arbitrarily on numerous occasions. This is a conclusion which follows from a summary of Parliamentary hearings held on Tuesday [19 January] on the President's budgetary message for 1993.

The document calls for increasing the fraction of territorial budgets in the consolidated RF budget to 50 percent. (The message sets them at 32.8 percent; subtraction of the R6,000,000,000,000 [rubles] to be channeled to extrabudgetary and federal funds reduces that percentage to 23). The budgetary system should include basic Federal extrabudgetary funds; "nonproductive and low priority expenses of the Federal budget" have to be cut.

The regions must have a right to collect 30 percent of export duties.

1992 Budget Deficit May Run to 1.1 Trillion Rubles

OW1901171293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1444 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] It is estimated that the deficit of the 1992 Russian combined budget might run to 1.1 trillion rubles, which exceeds 5% of the GNP. The local budgets are believed to have a deficit of 350-380 Bn [billion] rubles. The figures were reported at parliamentary hearings on the 1993 draft budget, by Finance Minister Vasiliy Barchuk.

He said that this year, 47.4% of the combined budget will be controlled by the federal government and 52.6% by the territories. So 27% of subsidies will come from the federal budget and 73% from the territories. The minister did not rule out the possibility that the 346 Mn [million] ruble subsidies to the coal industry will be given over to local administrations.

He also stated that per capita figures of budget spending range from 24,000 to 100,000 rubles. In Koryak, Chukchee and some other northern territories the figure exceeds 100,000 while in Moscow it is merely 26,000. The minister said the government will insist on the revision of pension tariffs as well as increasing the value added tax from 20% to 22-23%.

Foreign Debts Total 75.8 Billion U.S. Dollars

LD2101093493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0820 GMT 21 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo January 21 TASS—Russia's foreign debts amounted to 75.8 billion U.S. dollars at the beginning of 1993, ITAR-TASS learnt this Thursday [21 January] from a government official who refused to be identified and who participated in the first Russian-Japanese consultations on trade and economic relations between the two countries, which ended in Tokyo on Wednesday.

According to the official, the Russian delegation at the consultations said that Russia appropriated 16.6 billion dollars to serve its debts in 1992.

Experts note that the Russian Federation could appropriate greater sums to serve debts and interest on them.

However, in that case the country would use up all export revenues for this purpose, and Moscow would have no hard currency to buy even most badly needed goods abroad, the so-called critical imports.

Fedorov Proposes Program To Curtail Inflation

LD2001123293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1201 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow January 20 TASS—Inflation in Russia may reach 55-60 per cent in January, but the government believes it can be curtailed to five per cent by the end of the year.

In December inflation reached 25-27 per cent and may double in January, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Anatolyy Chubays said at a government meeting on Wednesday [20 January], acknowledging that the government "failed to curb inflation".

But another deputy prime minister, Boris Fedorov, proposed a financial and economic plan for 1993 which aims to curtail inflation to five per cent a month by the end of the year.

The budget deficit is also to be reduced to five per cent of the gross national product, according to Fedorov's plan which envisages the stabilisation of the rouble by the second half of the year, a slower industrial slump and stabilisation of production.

"The country is in a very difficult situation...and urgent measures are to be adopted", Fedorov said, adding that priority should be given to the strengthening of the rouble, the stabilisation of production and social sphere. His plan envisages a two-fold increase of interest rate on deposits of the popualtion in state banks which is to compensate for inflation and stimulate savings rather than spendings.

The government criticised the implementation of reforms in the second half of 1992. Only 57 out of 152 envisaged measures were fully implemented, other 47 measures were implemented partially, Chubays said. Among the fulfilled measures he listed the collapse of the administrative and command system of management, the initiation of a new financial system in Russia, the privatisation programme.

Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin strictly demanded to fulfil the adopted decisions and improve the work of executive authorities. He also called for urgent anti-inflation measures.

Chernomyrdin urged to determine concrete goals and "directions where we have to move". All economic decisions are to be thoroughly analysed to avoid any upsurge of inflation, he stressed.

Members of the presidium of the government decided to work out their recommendations concerning the plan of financial and economic stabilisation in 1993 and submit them in a week for the final approval.

Government Amends Price Regulation Decree

PM2101110993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 20 Jan 93 First Edition pp 1, 2

[ITAR-TASS report under the "Sensation" rubric: "Has the Vice Premier Revoked the Premier's Decree?"]

[Text] As reported in the press, Vice Premier Boris Fedorov has reacted negatively to the price regulation decree signed on the last day of the old year by Premier Viktor Chernomyrdin. He was out of the country at the time and promised in an interview that when he returned to Moscow he would try to rectify the situation. At a press conference yesterday, Boris Fedorov announced that the Russian Government has adopted a decree on further measures concerning the state regulation of inflation, which effectively renders the overwhelming majority of the provisions of the Russian Council of Ministers' previous decree of 31 December inoperative.

Boris Fedorov recognized that the 31 December decree "provoked a mixed reaction and was interpreted by many people as a repudiation of the reform policy and a backward move." That was why the new decree, signed yesterday, was prepared. It "clearly indicates that the government intends stepping up the fight against inflation, the destabilization of the economy, and the collapse of the money system and will seek to expand the range of methods of market regulation." Noting that the new decree uses "fairly tough words," Boris Fedorov announced that the government's decree "prohibits the central organs of federal executive power from using administrative means to regulate prices which have already been freed except in the case of monopolist enterprises."

The decree notes that the government is going to strengthen financial and money-credit policy in order to curb inflation, prevent the unchecked growth of the budget deficit, and not allow expenditure without the means to back it up.

The vice premier announced that the decree adopted today proposes "increasing the interest rates on savings accounts so as to protect the population from inflation and at the same time influence the whole structure of interest rates in the country as part of the fight against inflation." The decree also proposes that the granting of state credits, benefits, and subsidies to enterprises be tightened up. It also instructs that a statute be elaborated on the federal insolvency and bankruptcy service and that in the first half of 1993 a trial reorganization be carried out of a number of insolvent enterprises which are squandering state resources and serving to fuel inflation.

Government Prepares Program To Develop Nuclear Energy

OW1801223193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1827 GMT 18 Jan 93

[From the "INTERFAX Business Report"—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian nuclear energy industry, which produces between 13% and 32% of the energy consumed by major industrial regions of the republic, virtually ceased to develop following the accident at the Chernobyl plant (Ukraine) in 1986.

Under the Russian government's program to build nuclear power plants the construction of blocks at the Balakovskaya (Volga basin), Kalininskaya (central Russia), and the Rostov (southern Russia) nuclear power plants, which came to a standstill after the Chernobyl catastrophe, will be completed by 1995.

PROGRAM CONSISTS OF TWO STAGES

Representatives of the Russian Ministry of Nuclear Energy (Minatom) said the program passed by the government December 28, 1992 and targeted for the period ending in 2010, fully complies with environmental protection legislation. Minatom representatives said the program will be conducted only if local authorities agree to the construction of a nuclear power plant on their territory (in recent years the main obstacle to the development of nuclear energy was protests over responsibility for the plants by local power structures).

The first stage of the program to run through 1995 foresees the launching of 3 blocks with a total capacity of 3 Mn [million] kwhrs [kilowatt hours] at the Balakovskaya, Kursk, and Kalininskaya plants; construction at these plants was begun prior to 1985 (there are currently 28 energy blocks in operation in Russia at 9 nuclear power plants with a total capacity of 20.2 megawatts).

Industry experts said that the Ministry for Environmental Protection made an ecological examination of the Balakovskaya and Kalininskaya plants and approved in principle the continuation of construction at the plants. The ministry will examine the Kursk plant this year.

Minatom representatives said the introduction of five or six blocks at the Balakovskaya, Yuzhno-Uralskaya (Urals), and Beloyarskaya (southwest Siberia) nuclear power plants, and the Voronezhskaya nuclear heat supply station (central Russia) will be conducted with the approval of government environmental experts.

The second stage of the program to embrace the years 2000-2010 includes increasing the power of nuclear power plants by installing a new generation energy blocks.

SAFER NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE OFFING

The program envisages the construction of safer nuclear power blocks to replace worn out equipment after the year 2000 at the Bilibinskaya (northeast Siberia), Novovoronezhskaya (central Russia), Kolskaya (northwest Russia), and Leningrad nuclear power plants.

The first generation of nuclear power plants was placed under special operating procedures in 1990 when annual safety inspections were begun. Preventive measures have reduced the number of emergency shutdowns from 2.2 cases at one reactor in 1988 to 0.9 in 1991 (based on 1989 information, this indicator in the U.S. was 2.2, Germany 1.0, and Japan 0.35).

The Russian Minatom has begun working with Western partners to ensure safe nuclear power; the Kursk plant is working with the French Electricity de France. Ministry experts also hope to work with the West to develop a sodium reactor.

KOLSKAYA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT PERMITTED TO EXPORT 10 THOUSAND TONS OF NICKEL

As part of a program to increase the safety of existing nuclear power plants, Russian President Boris Yeltsin has signed a decree on hard currency financing for the renovation of the Kolskaya power plant, a major source of electric energy in northwest Russia.

The plant will be renovated using hard currency revenues from the export of 10,000 tons of nickel. Under a proposal by regional administration and the Russian Minatom, the nickel will be supplied by the Severonickel plant, part of the Norilsk Nickel concern (Russia's largest producer of nickel, copper, cobalt, and platinoids. The concern's enterprises consume 40% of the energy produced at the Kolskaya plant).

The 1.76 Mn kwhr Kolskaya plant has four water-cooled reactors with a capacity of 0.44 Mn kwhrs each. The first block was put into operation in 1973.

Ministry To Promote Nuclear Power Plants

LD1901175993 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By correspondent B. Baryshnikov from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The shortage of power is again urgently placing the possibility of using atomic energy on the agenda.

[Baryshnikov] The Russian Federation Ministry for Atomic Energy is sure that demands abroad that nuclear power plants on our territory be closed have not only been provoked by the Chernobyl disaster and concern about their own safety. The main aim of our western

opponents, specialists think, is to oust a supercompetitor—the Russian atomic energy industry—from the East European, Near Eastern and, what is particularly astounding, from our own home markets.

At a news conference organized by the management of the Ministry of Atomic Energy, Russian and foreign journalists were told that the operation of currently functioning nuclear power plants and the construction of new plants will continue, in accordance with expediency and with existing environmental protection legislation, taking into account public opinion and with the agreement of the local and territorial bodies of state power and administration. In the first stage, it is planned to bring three power units at the Balakovo, Kursk, and Kalinin nuclear plants into operation by 1995. The remarks and proposals made by the State Ecological Commission will be taken into account and implemented in the designs. Once an overall state fuel and power program is put together, the decision to bring these power units into operation will only be taken if the ecological safety requirements are met. [Video shows nuclear power plants, news conference in progress.]

Update on Atomic Energy Plants 11-18 Jan

OW1901203893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1749 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At nine atomic energy plants operating in Russia today, 28 energy blocs are producing a general output of over 20 megawatts [mWt]. Currently under repair are the fourth bloc of the Novovoronezhsky Nuclear Power Plant, the first bloc of the Kalininsky plant (both stations are located in central Russia), and the second bloc of the Leningradsky plant. The first bloc of the Smolensky plant is undergoing major repairs and the third bloc of the Kursky plant is under mid-level repairs.

Within the past week the following incidents took place at Russian nuclear power plants: on January 11 at the fifth bloc of the Novovorenezhsky plant a turbogenerator was shut down due to a short circuit, causing the energy bloc's output to be reduced by 50%. The turbogenerator was restarted in an hour.

On January 14 an emergency protection system was activated in the third bloc of the Balakovsky plant (in Povolzhe). The bloc was put into commission on January 15.

Output was reduced to 100 mWt in the first bloc of the Kalininsky plant on January 15. (The station's output is 2000 mWt.) On the same day the bloc was brought under major repairs.

On January 16 a turbogenerator was stopped in the fifth bloc of the Novovoronezhsky plant in connection with improperly completed repairs on the emergency protection system. The turbogenerator was turned back on within 24 hours.

Military Issues

Yeltsin Issues Order on Missile Technology Exports

OW1501093793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1700 GMT 14 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian president issued an order (N 20-RP of 11.01.93) confirming the list of equipment, materials and technology used in building missiles, whose export shall be regulated and licensed. The list includes rocket systems, and ballistic missiles, able to carry warheads weighing over 500 kg for a distance of more than 300 kilometers, parts of these systems, ability to produce the missiles, technology, and materials.

Air Defense Forces Assembly Discusses Reforms

PM2001091193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 2

[Lieutenant Colonel Aleksandr Ivanov report: "Operational Assembly at the Air Defense Forces High Command]

[Text] Amid the reform being carried out in the Russian Armed Forces, the Air Defense Forces are entering a new phase in their development. Questions concerning the building of an air defense system, a concept for the use and application of men, equipment, and weapons, and amendments in the organizational-staffing structure were discussed at a three-day assembly. It was addressed by Colonel General Viktor Prudnikov, commander in chief of the Russian Federation Air Defense Forces; his deputies; commanders of large strategic formations, combined units, and categories of forces; and chiefs of directorates and services.

International Affairs

Kravchuk Holds News Conference on Moscow Visit

LD1801222393 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1300 GMT 18 Jan 93

[News conference by President Leonid Kravchuk in Kiev following return from Moscow visit—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Unidentified NEZAVISIMAYA correspondent] Respected President. Please tell us how you assess the events that have taken place in the last few days, in particular today in the Supreme Council, and do you intend to be in Minsk and with which proposals?

[Kravchuk] Thanks to the fact that we—it seems to me not us, but the states of the former USSR and individual leaders of these states, or states which have been formed on the territory of the former Union—it seems to me that they are making haste in some CIS political issues and a situation has arisen in which society, our Ukrainian society, has divided into certain groups. One group considers that we must immediately accept the statute or at least accept it as a basis—I have in mind the CIS statute. Another group considers that not only is there no justification for signing this statute but that it is necessary to immediately leave the framework of the CIS. However, it seems to me these are extreme viewpoints and it is necessary to think about them very seriously.

Today I conducted a brief opinion poll for myself and want to tell you about it. I asked several directors a question, one directly, others by telephone: Please tell me, you are entering an agreement with a firm concerning the delivery of production. But they do not tell you at what price. They do not tell you the terms of delivery of the production but say: first let's sign the agreement that you will send us part of the production and the rest we will decide later. Would you sign such an agreement? They all said no.

Then why are you forcing the president to sign the statute; I took hold of it, here it is, where beginning, I stress, beginning with Article 8—and there are in all 48 articles—it is written everywhere that such and such an article, say Article 8: On the basis of a decision of the Council of Heads of States of the Commonwealth, the state may join as associate member. It further states that issues will be regulated by a separate agreement or procedural regulations. And so, every page, you see, it is all underlined, it is all underlined, Articles 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, and 30, where it is stated that it is necessary first to sign this statute and then agreements will be prepared, procedural regulations will be resolved. It could happen that these agreements which will later be adopted will bring to nothing even the not so bad provisions of this statute.

Further—where I have written in red, underlined—this is everything that is to be created: a coordinating and [word indistinct] organs. A budget is envisaged, a secretariat is envisaged, committees are envisaged, and so on and so forth. Can I then sign this draft statute, which contains no package of documents but only envisages that someone will one day do this. Obviously, you understand the situation the president is in.

Second, there is a Supreme Council resolution where it is clearly and accurately written that the resolution when the treaty between states on the CIS was ratified—it is stated that the main task of the president and the government is to strengthen the legal status of an independent state—a subject of international law will not allow the transformation of the CIS into a state with its own organs of power and management, will not allow the granting of the status of a subject of international law and so on, to the CIS. I am reading this from the resolution. So the draft statute does not correspond to the requirements of Ukraine neither in essence nor can it be signed from the legislative and formal point of view because it is not permitted by the reservations. This is our position, expressed clearly and accurately.

There is still one more situation. Imagine that suddenly all states gathered in Minsk and said: let us begin uniting. Can we believe that the problems which exist in Ukraine today will start to be resolved more quickly? Can we believe that oil will begin to be sent centrally within the limits of the 50 million tonnes, and gas and other things? That we again want to pass the resolution of our own state tasks to somebody else, and that we really can believe that this somebody else will do this for us in the interest of the people of Ukraine? Once again the answer to the direct question put to many was negative. Everybody knows that this will not happen. Only we together will resolve the problems connected with our state and we must find ways of resolving these problems here at home, in Ukraine, together in Ukraine, and not to think that somebody will do this for us.

I would like everybody to understand that the CIS statute is not a problem of improving matters but a political problem, around which it is possible to realize any insinuations about what certain political forces are doing. Therefore, my reservations, my requests, come down to the fact that we must be guided by the realities of life and not by the desires of individual forces, and not by intensifying the situation. Ukraine is not...[Kravchuk changes thought] In any case the president of Ukraine, guided by this document which I have just read to you, does not raise the question about withdrawal from the CIS. We say that the CIS is an ineffective structure. During its work 130 documents have been adopted but the majority of them do not function, and Ukraine signed most of them. This means this structure is ineffective. How to make it such that it would help to solve joint problems which exist here—the debt, the assets, the strategic armed forces, and other lawful and inter-state relations—how to do this? We must think about this. But this does not mean that we have to immediately adopt the statute which would oblige everybody to stand to attention and fulfill the respective provisions.

There is still one more thing. If, within the framework of the CIS, an economic agreement is not be adopted whereby all issues connected to energy sources and such like are regulated, then no statute, nothing will help. [passage omitted] It is necessary to find ways of coordinating our problems as a state, and it seems to me—and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin said this in his speech—that we are meeting as two great states, Ukraine and Russia, and we must find ways of resolving our problems by building our state and defending our people. It seems today that this is the most important thing and that everything else is... [Kravchuk changes thought] It is necessary to include everything else—the word, the action, and specific work.

[Unidentified Ukrainian Television correspondent] Respected Leonid Makarovych, it is understood that priority now is given to the economy. Tell us, if you would please, how the difficulties of economic relations are solved within the framework of the CIS, and, in accordance with a lot of documents which have been signed during visits, what future possibilities for the development of economic cooperation with foreign countries are held by the Ukrainian program of development and reforming. Also, if you can, what in your opinion are the main principles of Ukraines' short-term economic development? Why were the foreign debts not discussed in Moscow?

[Kravchuk] I will start at the end. The debts were discussed. They just did not result in the signing of a relevant agreement because creditors too, represented by the Paris and the London Clubs, should take part in such a meeting and express their view. Those proposals which the Ukrainian-Russian delegation have worked out together have been submitted to those Clubs for consideration. It is absolutely necessary for us to have the creditors' viewpoint. It is their right to express their viewpoint. [Words indistinct] this problem is so to speak at the stage of being solved; I repeat, the negotiations continue.

As for the economy, I want us to reject a stereotype which has been imposed on us—personally speaking it has not been imposed, it originated at the time of the USSR—to the effect that we used to pass over all the economic problems which concern the interests of our people, our state, and our republic to be solved outside the borders of our republic. We must now do it ourselves. I will give you one example: at international prices, a tonne of oil costs $120—a tonne of oil. A tonne of metal, if one has a certificate or some other agreements, costs between approximately $250 to $600, the average price is $400. Thus we can get 3 tonnes of oil for a tonne of metal. Ukraine smelts altogether about 40 million tonnes of metal, at any rate it used to do so. Ukraine's internal needs amount to a maximum of 18 million tonnes. Therefore, we can sell 20 million tonnes—20 million. In simple estimates, that is 60 million tonnes of oil at the international rate. I have not even mentioned all the other things. Thus everything can be settled and done without looking for someone to help us, to give us something, or to make us a present, we can do it here in Ukraine.

Therefore, our economic policy must be built proceeding from the interests of the people of Ukraine and using the links which exist today between the states of the CIS. It is a different matter, and we say it openly: There are effective links which can and will exist for a long time; there are links which are needed temporarily in order not to lose the positions and not to throw the economy into an even worse state; and there are links which are needed neither by Russia, nor by Ukraine, nor by Belarus, nor by anyone, which were imposed by the center through administrative methods. One should reject those links; again, however, it should be done gradually and sensibly, both in the interests of Russia, Belarus, other states, and Ukraine. This should be our main principle.

The second point: We must reach international parameters and norms of economic life and economic cooperation, both in accounts, in production, in quality, and in everything that concerns our interests. Third, we must overcome the idea, let us say, of all the structures, both state and economic, that the only way to solve problems is through a tight unbreakable integration with just one side. We must develop integration processes both with Europe and other states which have advanced technology and advanced science. But to break the links, let us say with Russia, today would not be solely irrational but simply dangerous. Let those who think so answer one simple question: (?Even though) we do not need 20 million tonnes of oil, can we take it today only from Russia.

The second thing: Only Russia has said today— and we have signed such an agreement—that, if you want, take those boreholes which do not work now and extract oil from them for yourselves. Where else can we find this, tell me if you please? Therefore I want it to be understood correctly that we must work with Russia as equal partners, as two states, two independent states, but we must work because the situation and the reality today are such that we are neighbors, and we must continue living on this geographical map and on this globe, to live and to cooperate. Everyone should remember this well and not look for the things that divide us, but for the things that do not harm our building up the economy and the state, those of Ukraine and Russia respectively. I think that it is a normal phenomenon and a normal development of events.

[Unidentified Radio Liberty correspondent] Leonid Makarovych, has Ukraine a variant of a functioning CIS; for instance, what package of documents is Ukraine using to prepare for the Minsk meeting on 22 January? In this context, several words on your assessment of the new formations in Central Asia. And an internal question: What level of approbation do the decrees of the Cabinet of Ministers go through in the presidential structures? How do you assess the first adopted decrees.

and how, as head of executive power, will you promote their implementation? Thank you.

[Kravchuk] In Minsk we want—I said so during a discussion with the president of Russia—to propose an economic treaty which would regulate, or help in regulating, those economic problems which have now developed within the CIS. All: economic, legal, I mean only the economic aspect of the matter. A draft of creating some councils, coordinating and other, on the basis of a treaty which each side—respectively Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, and others - fulfills. We are preparing such a draft document and we will propose it, maybe not at this meeting, we will simply not have time, because the time limit demands that it should be submitted 15 days in advance. But we will present the main principles.

I believe that it is a realistic step today because the economy is the basis of everything. Problems arise and they must be solved in the economic sphere. However, I repeat, when I say an economic treaty it means again common money, common banks, and (?common things with nothing in common). It means normal relations between states, each of which has its own laws, and which solves its problems regulating them with other states. As for political realities, they exist in the CIS. I have already mentioned them. Ways of solving them should be found. My opinion is that one should confirm, let us say today, that the CIS should work within the framework of the status which exists today.

Nobody should adopt whatever responsibilities to change that status, because it has been fixed by treaties and has been ratified by the Parliaments of Ukraine, Russia, and respectively of other states. If another status is at issue, it should be widely and deeply discussed—whether it is needed, and whether today is the time to return to that. I believe that it is simply a political game of those who want to make use of it in order to create an image: Just look at Ukraine; it has broken it up and it wants to break it up further, and so forth. It does not correspond to reality.

[Liberty correspondent] The new formations in Central Asia—what do you think of them?

[Kravchuk] I think the following: States are already looking for some common, closer geographical, and maybe ethnic, root—religious, political communities—and they unite in certain regions. Maybe Central Asia decided thus that it is necessary to try to unite, but again, for me today it is rather a political statement than reality, because a formation will be strong when it is based on some treaties, absolutely specific treaties, and since there are no such treaties...[Kravchuk changes thought] Let us say that suddenly Turkmenistan approaches Ukraine, saying that it is necessary to come and solve the question to do with gas. Why? Uzbekistan has raised the price of transporting gas. Uzbekistan has raised it, but Ukraine has to answer for that to Turkmenistan. Where in the world do things like this happen? [passage omitted] Therefore, I think there is a lack of seriousness there which will allow the regulation of issues, even between the states of Central Asia. As for decrees, government decrees, they are not a subjective product, let us say a creation, of what there is in a government. They have been called forth by life, they must be regulated because a lot of problems have not been regulated in those laws adopted by the Supreme Council. The Supreme Council has passed a regulation in the sphere of the economy, a legislative regulation, to the Cabinet of Ministers. I am far from idealizing all those decrees which the Cabinet of Ministers has adopted. But the majority of them are the decrees called forth by objective processes which take place in life, in the life of the economy and other spheres of life.

Second, after some time has passed, the government and the president will analyze these decrees, and if something needs to be changed it can be changed, but without changing political aspects—but some regulations and paragraphs can be changed. By the way, a meeting took place today here with directors of metallurgical enterprises and respective trade unions. We agreed that the Government will create respective councils, consisting of directors, sector by sector: metallurgists, miners, machinery constructors—and the government will discuss draft documents and check whether they correspond to the needs of life, and will not adopt them straight away. Here I want to say that it is a very complex process. You can see the difficulties in adopting documents adopted at the Supreme Council. Inacuracies are overlooked there too. There are also inaccuracies in presidential decrees. The Cabinet of Ministers is no guarantee against mistakes. The main thing is to see mistakes in time and to correct them respectively. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent from (DEKPRIZ), Moscow] I have an internal and political question. Respected Leonid Makarovych, in the New Year address to the Ukrainian people you said that the foundation of Ukrainian statehood is only just being laid. The new law on elections must become one of the [word indistinct] stones of that statehood. I have a conceptual question for you: Which election system do you support, the majority [word indistinct] which is there now; the proportional one proposed by the Popular Movement [Rukh], or a mixed one, 50-50 so to speak? I would like you to substantiate your opinions.

[Kravchuk] I will not explain this issue in detail because it is a (?special) issue. I only want to say one thing: that I support and will support a democratic election system which would be based on the principles of a multiparty system. A real multiparty system not just a verbal one, but one which would make it possible for each party to take part in elections, not formally but in reality and after that to take part respectively, either a party or a coalition or a block party, to have in the parliament and to lean on those parties in solving the issues concerning the interests of both Ukraine and the people of Ukraine. [sentence as heard] I will support that and I am for such laws to be adopted as quickly as possible.

As for details, they will have to be reflected in those laws. If the deputies come to a conclusion that such a system must be there, it will be such, if not—it will be a different one. But it must necessarily be democratic and be based on a multiparty basis. It is necessary.

[Correspondent Mykola Puhovitsa from SILSKAYA ZHIZN V UKRAYINE] Respected Leonid Makarovych, in the past ten years the villages have not experienced a spring with such alarm as the present one. First and foremost this concerns the provision of oil products. During the last [word indistinct] I came across cases where in order to get to the rayon center from the village people travelled on the milk cart. One section is for milk and the people sit in the other section. As is known, the government has allocated 65 percent having earlier promised that the village would allocate oil products. Is there hope that these oil products today will not disappear like last year s 8 million did? In general, as president, what can you say today to the village on the eve of the sowing campaign and before the spring which is already upon us.

[Kravchuk] With regard to oil, I repeat that we have agreed to 20 million tonnes with Russia. This is the quota for Ukraine, the state quota of Russia. We have also agreed in advance—perhaps some kind of agreement will even be signed—that in the first quarter more oil will be delivered in order to guarantee the village oil and oil products during the sowing campaign. There is an agreement about this.

Second, accordingly, the leaders of our oil and gas structures have already gone to western Siberia in order to jointly solve the question of how to revatilize the boreholes which already have stopped functioning. The oil which will appear will be an addition to this 20 million tonnes. The relevant negotiations are being held with Kazakhstan and other places wherever possible in order to guarantee oil. [passage omitted]

I can agree to sit behind a table with anybody and to find ways of solving any problem here at home, with democrats, republicans, socialists, with anybody but only to the point where they begin to link the problems with our independence. [passage omitted]

[Name indistinct, correspondent from the daily newspaper KOMERSANT] Mr. President, how do you assess the package of economic agreements signed in Moscow and, specifically, how do these agreements differ from the drafts which were prepared by the Ukrainian delegation? And with your permission, another question: In Moscow today the Supreme Council of Russia has raised the issue of the status of Crimea...

[Kravchuk, interrupting] Sevastopol or the Crimea?

[Correspondent] Sorry, Sevastopol. What is Ukraine's reaction?

[Kravchuk] I will begin from the end, about Sevastopol. We probably will not react, because we have already reacted as we could. Both the Supreme Council Presidium and the president have made a corresponding statement. We have documents, I stress not simply statements, but documents which underscore that beginning with 1955 Sevastopol was both financed and located and is located, in accordance with our decisions and the decisions of the Supreme Council of the Russian Federation, within the composition of Ukraine. This latest thing is just to unleash who knows what, excuse me, around this problem which never was a problem for Ukraine in the legal, international aspect.

We will not discuss this with anybody, absolutely. You should know that this is the position, because here we do not see any grounds for such a discussion, although I know that at the moment there are rallies in Sevastopol and there are even appeals to raise the Russian flag above Sevastopol. Probably they realize the responsibility of those who are calling for this, that he [as heard] impinges on the territorial integrity of our state, that he is creating lawlessness and accordingly must know that laws will be used. This is simply so that it is understood. Again they speculate around the CIS: Let's go this way, let's go that way. Strictly speaking there are forces who would very much like some misfortune to begin.

The economic agreements which we signed with Russia, they are basically like the ones that were prepared here. I consider that neither Russia nor Ukraine lost out as a result of them, that we built them on the objective analysis of the vital processes which are taking place in Russia and in Ukraine and raised ourselves above the ambitions, above the temporary objectives and looked at the future, at the relations of both states, both peoples, at the development of the Russian and Ukrainian states and on this basis we were able to sign such agreements which, it seems to me, meet the interests of our peoples and states.

[Correspondent Ley] Olha Ley, MOLODA HAZETA. Respected Mr. President, you noted that you are preparing a document on the occasion of the division of debts and assets. Has Russia provided accurate data about which debts and assets these are? That is the first question. The second: Has the question of material compensation to Ukraine in connection with the reduction of nuclear weapons which are on its territory been discussed in Russia, and what are the possible mechanisms for this compensation?

[Kravchuk] Again, proposals are being prepared—I am beginning from the second question relating to strategic nuclear forces and atomic weapons—corresponding proposals are being prepared: How to compensate? What are the ways of such compensation, the scale of such compensation? The technical problems around this matter are being analyzed, that is, ways of destroying and the procedure for destroying nuclear weapons, time-scales, and everything else.

Proposals are being prepared and the appropriate document will be signed. After this, there can be talk of the

scale of compensation and what it will consist of, as they say, having calculated the plus and the minus. [Word indistinct] we have a commission and it is led by Minister of Ecology Kostenko. They work and work actively together with the Russian delegation. Defense Minister Kostyantyn Petrovych Morozov is also working and sao is Grachev. So the question is in a quite a serious stage of serious analysis and preparation of proposals.

With reference to the foreign debts and assets I cannot add more to what I have said. The proposals of Russia and Ukraine have been submitted to the Paris and London Clubs. Once these proposals have been examined, and depending on the position which the creditors take, we will be able to move further along the route of resolving this problem: to sign the appropriate document.

[Correspondent Boyko] Oksana Boyko. Respected Leonid Makarovych, next in line for discussion by the parliament is the START I treaty. How do you see the situation surrounding Ukraine if our parliament does not ratify this treaty. In your opinion, in what event will we cause ourselves irreparable damage? And what guarantees of nuclear safety is Russia prepared to give us in the event we do ratify this treaty?

The second question again relates to oil. How long is the term given to us by Russia for the right to develop oil wells? Could it not happen that we invest money and labor, begin extracting oil there and Russia will take back the concern?

[Kravchuk] Well, as far as ratification of the START I Treaty is concerned, I have spoken about there being a corresponding need for several serious arguments for our parliament in favor of ratification. I understand the concern of parliament and the deputies. It is their right to dig for the truth, because they are voting for a relevant document which has great significance for the consequences of our state, our security, our strength, and our power. We should give the deputies such arguments.

The first argument is security guarantees. Such drafts have been prepared, as I already know, both by the Russian side, and the U.S. President has also agreed with the Ukrainian position, so that the United States is to give an appropriate security guarantee. This is the first thing. I think that when we read these documents to the deputies, then the deputies will understand that these are not simply words but real steps toward guarantees.

Second is the financial-legal side of the matter, what costs are fixed, what part of the costs should be repaid to us, and what assistance, for example with regard to destroying nuclear weapons, should be given. I believe that Ukraine, as a state that is third in nuclear strength, that is voluntarily laying down these nuclear weapons in accordance with the Treaty, should also claim help regarding their destruction, especially as we have, you know, an economic crisis, and it is very difficult to expect us to manage this task on our own. That is, everyone is interested in nuclear strength decreasing. Help is needed in order to carry out this destruction. We do not want to be viewed as doing some sort of trading or to gain some sort of dividend from this. Absolutely not. It is for destruction, and destruction is a complex, very complex, technological process. This is the second thing.

The third thing is the very method of this destruction—who, when, and over what period. I have previously stated the figure for you; the 130 complexes with fuel, located here in Ukraine. Equipping them with their components took place, and this with the help of Russian technology; accordingly another class of missiles located in Ukraine and beyond Ukraine's boundaries, on Russian soil, were also equipped with components with the help of Ukrainian specialists, in particular those from our Southern Kharkov plant association [nashe obyednannya Pivdennyy Kharkivskyy Zavod]. In this way we should agree on how all this is going to happen.

So, after this I expect that when we give these arguments to parliament, then it will not reject our former position expressed in the declaration [of Sovereignty], in the relevant resolutions of the Supreme Council, where it has been said that Ukraine is striving to become a non-nuclear state in the future, and that this should take place in accordance with laws and agreements which will be adopted by the Supreme Council, and which will be based on international documents on this matter.

When the issue of oil wells is decided it will be decided on the basis of [word indistinct] an agreement which will be signed. I do not think that we must always be on guard against some unpleasant acts with regard to us, although in reality an agreement must be signed and it must be agreed accordingly.

[Unidentified correspondent] Respected Leonid Makarovych, I ask that you once again return to the question of the destructive image of Ukraine which is being created in the Russian mass media. I emphasize precisely once again because, regardless of your call which was heard at the press conference on 15 January, in subsequent broadcasts it was heard again. This question is interesting because it is worrying and because we continue to be in the single information space, and the issue about the Ostankino TV company will probably be discussed further at these meetings. I ask your opinion on this.

[Kravchuk] I look at things realistically. The broadcasts are written by appropriate persons and newspapers are also written by appropriate persons with an appropriate position, philosophy, thinking, whether it is new or old. But they possess this and today, say, nobody can ban them from thinking as they consider fit—not the president of Ukraine nor the president of Russia. This is their right, the right of conscience, the right to understand, the right to be guaranteed information because it could happen that a person writes something which is not correct because he simply does not know it but must write [about it]. So he writes whatever comes into his head. Therefore, we must understand this, help everybody, and not to be offended, not to be offended. It is a

different matter when you see that, as they say, their ears are already sticking out from behind a broadcast. They are absolutely sticking out that he is consciously directed not at supporting but is definitely against. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified ZAKON I BIZNES correspondent] ZAKON I BIZNES. Respected Leonid Makarovych, on 19 December the Supreme Council voted in a law on the legal profession of Ukraine but as far as I know, the resolution on putting this law into effect has not yet been signed. Incidentally, this was one of the questions which greatly concerned the delegates of the congress of lawyers of Ukraine which took place in the last few days in Kiev. If possible, can you explain what reservations the president has with regard to this law and when will the resolution on putting into effect this law on the legal professional of Ukraine, which both lawyers and citizens of Ukraine are waiting for, be signed? Thank you.

[Kravchuk] By way of a reply, I do not know the details of this issue. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] Leonid Makarovych, in official reports about your meeting with Boris Yeltsin there is the phrase: Problems around the Black Sea Fleet have been removed. Could you interpret this phrase, because on the surface there is only one fact: the substitution of one leader of the Fleet, the Russian Admiral Kasatonov for another military leader, also Russian, Vice Admiral Blatin [corrects himself] Baltin, excuse me.

And the second question. In your speech on 12 January in the Knesset of the State of Israel you stated that Ukraine cannot be peaceful if some danger threatens the Holy Land, the State of Israel. In the last few days in the press there is information about the possible threat by Iraq against the State of Israel. What would be the actions of Ukraine and yourself, as president, if such a threat really exists?

[Kravchuk] What did we mean when we spoke about respective problems being removed with regard to the Black Sea Fleet? First, we confirmed that the Yalta agreement relating to the Black Sea Fleet should be operational, be improved, and enrich what is behind this agreement regarding the percentages, the financing, the oath—all of these aspects that are indicated there. We also realized that it was very difficult to appoint a commander in chief. We appointed him.

I do not link, say, devotion to the interests of Ukraine solely according to national characteristics. I can [word indistinct] give you examples of Ukrainians who, God forbid, are worse than others. It seems to me the main thing is that we resolve the issue in such a way which may be resolved today, not appealing for or not creating a confrontational ground in Sevastopol. Because the city is explosive and these forces which want to take advantage of this also understand this. [passage omitted]

Today the question arises, that Ukraine should have the Fleet and in Sevastopol they should not start a war. [words indistinct] I would not like you to understand it in such a way that if somebody is Ukrainian then it is good, but if it is somebody else then it is definitely bad. This is the first thing.

The second point [words indistinct] this is what I had in mind. I had this in mind when I returned from Jerusalem, because we were there. Really, three great religions originated from there. [passage omitted] We must not permit it to be destroyed. We must not! We do not have the right! This is the interest of all peoples, not just Ukraine. Then I said that we must do everything to prevent the destruction of this because mankind and civilization would lose much. Obviously it would lose if such places are destroyed, moreover such a holy place. This is what I had in mind.

Ukraine is prepared and shows an example: to take part in negotiations through the UN, through the appropriate structures of the UN organization. Let us say we are taking part in Yugoslavia. We are ready for all actions which the UN decides. To take part in order not to permit the outrage, the vandalism of those places, the honor, the conscience of mankind on our planet.

[Unidentified correspondent] [passage omitted] My first question, a group of deputies has now assembled in parliament at the bidding of the Lugansk delegation. You seem somehow not to have said very much about this, when answering the question of my colleague about parliament. A parliamentary crisis could occur there. And the second question, we (?have) information that there are letters from Russia and the United States, but we do not hear the voices of China, Britain, or France. Are you not bothered by the fact that we do not hear France, for example?

[Kravchuk] It is easier for me [words indistinct]. You see, the United States is taking part in the negotiating process on reducing nuclear weapons, and so is the former Union, which had signed the treaty then, and now the states, which have formed on the territory of this Union. Neither Britain, nor France, nor China are involved in this. And therefore, as these states [as heard] are taking part, then we have above all relevant requests, relevant wishes, I have said, reservations, to these very states. It is another matter, when the president of a state which voluntarily takes upon itself such a historical act, to be the first to destroy nuclear weapons, while being, let us say, a great nuclear power [sentence as heard]. We always say that these weapons are not directly managed by Ukraine today, and in connection with this we do not regard ourselves as a nuclear state. However, they are on our land. We bear the responsibility. And we can, we could at least use relevant measures in order to make them ours, let's say, by force. But we refuse to do this. We refuse voluntarily. And so we ask for such guarantees. I would like other states to follow our example as well. Whether they will follow it or not, is already their affair. Because so far they are not taking part in the START I and START II treaties. [passage omitted]

[Sokil] PRAVDA UKRAYINY, Oleksandr Sokil. Leonid Makarovych, the Ukrainian-Russian talks in Moscow received a wide response in Ukraine. They are being commented on in an optimistic way. But there is silence in Russia about this meeting, and not only on the part of the mass media, but also on the part of the politicians. In connection with this, what are the grounds for optimism? For there has been more than one such meeting in the past. They proceeded very well. But we did not perceive this in practice. As a continuation of this, what hopes do you place on, well, the impending meeting in Minsk? Thank you.

[Kravchuk] Well, naturally, to guarantee today that these very documents that we signed are the best, and that these very documents will now begin to be implemented, as they say, from A to Z, well, it is probably hard for me to say this. But those meetings and conversations which I had, for example with the president of Russia, we had a private conversation, a very lengthy conversation, with Chernomyrdin, the prime minister, with Vice Premier Khizha, and with others, I perceived, well perhaps I am mistaken, I do not want to vouch for it, this is my feeling, as they say, which, well, corresponds to reality 100 percent; I perceived that Russia has also got tired of what is called struggle, what is called some sort of actions, pressure, and so on; they want to find paths of resolving issues, problems, which would both protect the interests of Russians, and would also not put others in a difficult situation. Well, I perceived this. (?Realistic) people (?in life) will, I expect, give me the opportunity to check this in practice.

Regarding Minsk, I think that if the heads of state want us to live in respect [sentence as heard]. You know, when we assemble, journalists often ask me this question, the impression is formed that it is easier for you to resolve issues with faraway foreign countries than with nearby ones, they often ask me. I say to them, and this is realistic, we do not have as many problems in common with faraway foreign countries, because here we lived in the same house, and have made such a mess that it now needs to somehow be cleaned up. But this does not mean that those are further, and these are nearer, that it is easier with those, and harder with these. It is necessary to look for ways of resolving certain specific problems with a specific state. If we are going to show respect, I very much want you to pay attention to this, then we will reach the correct conclusion.

I sometimes hear this now: Here, Ukraine does not want it, well let it carry on alone. What does not want mean? Not to want to sign a document—then Ukraine has arguments for this. They ought to hear Ukraine out if we are members of the CIS. You just look at the respect with which the European states treat each other; now, when the talk was about the European Community. Let France hold a referendum, they said. One state cannot enter, they wait until it (?comes through) a referendum. But here, according to the principle of the old Politburo, you don't obey, then live as you please. There are some, whose hands are virtually trembling to say, we will show it [Ukraine], we will punish it, we [words indistinct] so that we will all unite, on their knees, they will come crawling, you understand. Here is where it is, here it is, this is all evident. I hear this when leaders speak, and already threaten, that we will go over to currency [as heard], that we will do this. You understand, this is not serious, and it is not done this way in international relations. But we have not matured enough for this. Each of those who make up the CIS regards himself as a member of that large body, the USSR, which gives him the right to impose his own view, and to adopt (?decisions by majority). This is the situation.

Therefore, I expect that in Minsk, if we respect and do not want to harm each other, state to state, people to people, then we will live in accordance with international norms and principles. I expect that we will come to an agreement on economic problems, above all. Those problems are stated in documents. They can be either confirmed, or, as they say, be moved away altogether. But to lead [the CIS] to a new status, this is simply an unrealistic matter for Ukraine today.

[Skachko] Volodymyr Skachko, HOLOS UKRAYINY [Voice of Ukraine]. I also have two questions, as has already become traditional. It is said that the last Ukrainian-Russian agreements were dictated by economic expediency. So, this is my question. Are the Russian concessions not based on a Slavic commonwealth in accordance with the example of a Central Asian commonwealth, as a counterbalance? This is the first question. The second is of a personal nature. Leonid Makarovych, do you wish to continue to remain president of the whole people? Or is there now some political force, which you are prepared to be guided by, and which is prepared to bear responsibility for you as president and leader of executive power of the country? Thank you.

[Kravchuk] Will this political force want to take upon itself such a load as to bear responsibility for the president? This is a serious matter. Well, this is the first thing. Second, it is also necessary to determine the extent to which the people stand behind that political force, which would even want to do this. If this policy is really supported by the people, and this party enjoys the respect of the people, then I would naturally be able to cooperate (?closely) with just such a party, which naturally has a majority, because it is very important for the president to rely on the support of a majority.

Unfortunately, at the moment there are no such forces yet that could state this. If I were now to take part in that struggle, which is going on for people, for policy, then I could harm these parties, harm them. I have already been convinced of this. Somewhere a careless word is said in support of some force, and this causes a corresponding reaction, and could not help [as heard]. Therefore, it seems to me that the time for this has not yet come. After all, it is necessary for this polarization, this (?jostling) of forces, their intentions, their programs, support for these intentions and programs, to somehow be more or less completed. Then one could think about

closer cooperation. Well, if this is delayed, then this will then be a problem after the elections to parliament and to local councils. Then it will be clearer, who has gained a majority, who has gained a majority. It is simply difficult to say now. I think it is necessary to wait, regarding this.

Regarding the Slavic commonwealth, this issue has not even been discussed. Nowhere in conversations, nor privately, nor simply at meetings or at discussions, in which the whole delegation takes part, we have not singled out this Slavic problem. This did not even enter our minds.

One thing, however, must be understood, that Ukraine and Russia, as the largest states of the former Union, are today the most closely linked and mutually dependent in the economic sphere. This should be borne in mind. This is understood by both Russians and Ukrainians. When I have spoken about this, both to journalists there, and I am saying it to you as well, I would very much like us to show this not as a process of Ukraine's interests being subordinated to Russia, or Russia's to Ukraine. This would not be beneficial, and it would be untrue. Because here we took into account all objective factors, so that the state, partnership, equal terms, good-neighborliness, so that it all remains, as they say, the alpha and omega of our policy. Relations should be such as would help these same determining principles of our policy and our nation building. Everything is subordinate to this, and not vice versa.

Both Russia and Ukraine understand this. As our relations are being developed on these principles, and of good-neighborliness as well, and there are not some sort of serious limitations, now, for example, oil [sentence as heard]. There is a pipe. There is an infrastructure. There is no problem in, for example, deliveries of oil, refining of oil. And so on. The railways. It is all there. Now it only has to be placed at the service of the economy. But placed in such a way, so that neither the statehood of Ukraine, nor the statehood of Russia, neither the interests of Ukraine, nor of Russia, are subordinated to this very thing. But vice versa, this is subordinated to the higher interests of the people. Everything meets here. I have understood that Russia is ready for this, and Ukraine has long been ready for this. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified VOA correspondent] What does Ukraine expect from the government of the newly elected U.S. President Bill Clinton, who is soon to be the new master of the White House? Thank you.

[Kravchuk] Ukraine would like to—I spoke about this with President Bush and when I greeted Clinton on his election as president—about the fact that Ukraine would like the May treaties, which were signed in the White House with President Bush, to develop, be enriched, and that relations between the United States and Ukraine develop and broaden. This is our greatest wish. We began our relations with quite a serious package of documents but they are not exhausted and by far do not exhaust our possibilities. The relations we have at the moment, say with the Bush administration, with the U.S. Embassy in Ukraine, are hopeful; they confirm that the United States would like to have good relations with Ukraine as with any state, and as was said, to build its policy toward Ukraine as a state, and not working this policy with the interests of other states, but with Ukraine. Then we will have good relations. We would like precisely these types of relations.

I hope the administration of the new President—as a rule this is a tradition of the United States—taking into account the succession in politics, including foreign policy, will be guided by precisely the interests of both states and the interests of Ukraine, which is in Europe and which can play a certain, I would even say a significant and stabilizing role, in Europe and throughout the whole region during this complicated time when the last and the biggest empire in the world is being destroyed.

[Unidentified correspondent] Ukrainian Press Agency. Leonid Makarovych, could you not give details of exactly what kind of security guarantees you are expecting, or have already received, from the United States of America and from Russia? Is this an agreement on defending territory in the event of an attack on Ukraine? Or is this a proposal to enter into military blocs?

[Kravchuk] You understand, in accordance with international interpretations, when one country gives security guarantees to another country, then a very wide range of issues is included in this, and these are: borders; territorial integrity; appropriate actions when an attack occurs, be it via the United Nations Organization, or some others, via the Security Council; keeping to all agreements, which are in this scheme, including the Helsinki ones, for example; that is, a whole package of clauses are included in this phrase, security, a guarantee of security, if one is to take the legal, political and military position.

It does not envisage any kind of being obliged to be in a bloc, or Ukraine's entering into some kind of military-political blocs. Ukraine acts in accordance with its strategy. The state giving the guarantees agrees with its political strategy and guarantees its security. This understanding is included in this concept. I put this issue in exactly this way, in exactly this way. This does not bring with it changes in our political concept, does not bring with it obligatory inclusion in blocs or anything else. Our policy is accepted as we have determined it. Other states, in this case the United States of America and Russia, correspondingly guarantee our security, and so that there is no attack, for example, on guarantees, no attack on our Ukrainian state. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified corrrespondent] This is my question. There is one very sad date, 800 years of Chernobyl. You know that in this evil, in this year, is 800 years of Chernobyl. You know, we have had seven years of this misfortune. So the question is this. The interests of Ukraine, the CIS, and all countries, meet in this evil.

How are we going to solve this urgent problem, which is urgent not only for Ukraine, but for the whole world. Because you know, that if another misfortune occurs, then there will be no conference, no nothing.

[Kravchuk] We are going to solve it in accordance with the documents, which have been adopted by the Supreme Council. I wish you all the best. Good bye.

Yukhnovskyy Discusses Division of USSR Debts

LD2001121093 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1100 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] Ihor Yukhnovskyy, Ukraine's first deputy prime minister, gave a news conference today at the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers. He informed journalists about issues regarding the foreign debts and assets of the former Soviet Union, and replied to the questions of those present.

He said Russia has thus far allocated to our state a sum to the value of $81 billion (?for the debts). Ihor Yukhnovskyy reported that repayment of this sum may begin only after it has been analyzed in detail. According to Ihor Yukhnovskyy, Ukraine has so far checked the justification regarding $38 billion. As to the money the Soviet Union once lent to other countries, it has now been established that the debtor states have a fairly low payment capability.

The first deputy prime minister emphasized the importance of dividing fairly the foreign assets and liabilities between the former republics of the USSR, and stressed the complexity of this process.

He also set forth his point of view on a number of other topical economic problems.

Parties Issue Statements on Attitudes Toward CIS

MK2001151993 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 93 p 1

[Irina Litvinova report under the "Ukraine" rubric: "CIS Charter: For and Against. Statements By Political Parties and Public Associations"]

[Text] Last weekend many Ukrainian political and public associations published statements on the republic's attitude toward the CIS and its charter.

In their appeal to President Leonid Kravchuk and Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma leaders of Donbass mining associations pressed for nationwide discussion of the draft CIS charter since "survival is only possible in conditions of the economic ties that have become established between the republics of the former USSR." Ukrainian Cossacks fully support Leonid Kravchuk and describe the CIS Charter as a "document that does not correspond to the Declaration of Ukrainian State Sovereignty." Representatives of industrial circles in Ukraine's seven eastern oblasts said that failure to sign the CIS Charter would deprive them of any hope for the future.

In the opinion of members of the Ukrainian Liberal Party, renunciation of the CIS Charter should not be linked with Ukraine's secession from the Commonwealth—these are two different problems. The liberals proposed that the meeting of the CIS heads of state in Minsk formulate not a charter but general principles for mutual relations between the CIS countries, principles that would ensure the necessary economic cooperation while preserving their own independence.

The opposition also had their say: Rukh advocates Ukraine's unconditional withdrawal from the CIS, while the "New Ukraine" association is in favor of its becoming an organ for cooperation.

Nikolayev Groups Oppose Signing

LD2001221893 Kiev Ukrayinske Telebachennya Network in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] A group of political and public organizations of Nikolayev Oblast came out against Ukraine's signing of the CIS Charter.

In the event that the Supreme Council of Ukraine resolves that this document be signed, they will demand that the ban on the activity of the Communist Party be reversed as well as that the Ukrainian parliament be dissolved and that direct presidential rule be introduced in Ukraine. This was stressed in their joint statement.

National Affairs

Supreme Council Meets Amid Socioeconomic Crisis

LD2001160793 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0830 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Report from Kiev by correspondent Vladimir Sokolov]

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Council session which was supposed to have ended at the end of last year, resumed in Kiev today and I would say that it is being resumed in an emergency. The idea of holding additional plenary sessions had been discussed, but they were planned for the end of January after the summit of heads of state in Minsk.

However, events have been hastened by the genuine social crisis that has flared up in Ukraine. It arose as a result of the Cabinet of Ministers' decree on price regulation in which virtually all prices were freed. What is more, the government reckoned on an inevitable rise in prices, approximately a doubling of prices. But what happened was a kind of price explosion and immediately after the New Year the cost of basic foodstuffs increased five to sevenfold: bread and meat, for example, went up tenfold; butter and sausages sixfold; and milk up to

eightfold. Also, the cost of municipal transportation increased tenfold and domestic rents doubled. At the same time, there have been cutbacks on important social programs such as the abolition of indexation of people's incomes or free travel for pensioners on municipal transportation.

One hardly needs to explain how the population has reacted to all this. And reflecting these heated emotions, a significant group of deputies and the trade unions demanded that the Supreme Council should be convened immediately to discuss the government's reform program, which has still not been made public, and the social consequences of the law-making acts already adopted by them. Added to this are the passions over the draft CIS Charter, which some in Ukraine believe must be signed for the Commonwealth of States to be genuinely effective, but which others resolutely reject, even wanting Ukraine to come out of the CIS immediately. And finally, significant forces in parliament are again raising the issue of revoking the unconstitutional decision on banning the Communist Party of Ukraine.

Anticipating events, the radical nationalists have begun parades and pickets to protest the signing of the CIS Charter, the Communist Party, and this early convening of the Supreme Council. On the issue of the Communist Party, Rukh has even come out with the hysterical statement that this holds the danger of a coup d'etat. Meanwhile, the Union of Officers of Ukraine has even gone as far as to talk of the threat of civil war.

Such is the atmosphere in which the Supreme Council opens its plenary sesssion this afternoon. The issue of the signing of the CIS Charter is not being raised at this session because the president has already firmly stated that Ukraine will not sign it. The issue of revoking the ban on the Communist Party is not yet being raised either. Top of the agenda for discussion are the issues of Ukraine's socioeconomic situation, social protection measures for the population, and financial problems. Then issues of legality, law and order will be discussed, also as a result of broad public dissatisfaction over the rise in corruption and crime, and also the issue of the State Auditing Control Service. Deputies can, of course, still change the proposed agenda, but the main things remain the problems of this socioeconomic crisis, discussion of which will clearly be stormy and will be watched closely by the whole of Ukraine.

Rukh Warns of 'Constitutional Coup' Attempt

LD2001095993 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 2300 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] The Popular Movement of Ukraine [Rukh] has promulgated a statement on the occasion of the renewal of the plenary session of the Ukrainian parliament. This document notes that under the guise of demagogy about social protection of the population's interests and under the appearance of a review of government decrees it is planned to discuss the resignation of the present Cabinet of Ministers, the CIS statute, and abolition of the Supreme Council Presidium resolution banning the activity of the Communist Party. The statement stresses that Rukh assesses these actions as a revolt against the Ukrainian state, as an attempt at a constitutional coup with the aim of abolishing the Ukrainian state. In this connection Rukh appeals to the citizens of Ukraine to resolutely protest these attempts.

'Coup' To Restore Communists

PM2101144393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jan 93 p 2

[Sergey Tsikora report: "Ukrainian Parliament Has Begun Work Ahead of Schedule"]

[Text] Kiev—Political passions and the economic situation in Ukraine have caused deputies of the republic Supreme Soviet to gather ahead of schedule and to begin plenary sittings of parliament four days early.

It is proposed, above all, to discuss questions of the socioeconomic situation in Ukraine and measures for the population's social protection, as well as the state of finances. This initiative comes from the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The political parties take different attitudes to the fact that an early start has been made on the session's work. A statement by the Socialist Party Political Council Presidium says that the unjustified increase in prices and the government's adoption of decrees which deepen the general crisis in society are the chief reason for urgently convening the session.

"Rukh" has a different viewpoint on what is happening. It believes that the decision was adopted under pressure from the communist majority in parliament. On the pretext of defending the people's interests, the communist majority actually plans to examine the question of the resignation of L. Kuchma's government, to declare its support for the CIS Charter, and to revive the Communist Party of Ukraine. "Rukh" regards these actions as a conspiracy against the Ukrainian state and an attempt at a constitutional coup aimed at eliminating Ukrainian statehood and restoring communist dictatorship.

The military have also had their say. In an appeal to the people and to servicemen, the Ukrainian Officers Union warned that certain forces in the republic Supreme Soviet want revenge, want to regain power, to restore the empire.

...Pickets have once again appeared outside the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

Prime Minister Kuchma's Politics Assessed

LD2101095893 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0600 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Report by correspondent Viktor Alekseyev from Kiev]

[Text] [Alekseyev] While supporters of changing course did manage to get parliamentary hearings appointed, nevertheless, this success was immediately undermined by a skillful maneuver by deputies of national-democratic orientation who are obviously in the minority. Setting aside their former quarrels, they refused to register, therefore, creating an artificial absence of a quorum. The indignant speeches of several representatives of the deceived majority were in vain. Not trying to hide his satisfaction, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Ivan Plyushch managed to put through a resolution on holding not a plenary session but a joint session of the standing commissions and government not authorized to adopt any decisions.

Ukrainian Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma, speaking in parliament, set forth in general terms his by now widely known principles for the anticrisis program. Kuchma noted that already when he was starting work in the post of head of executive power he was clearly aware of the disastrous economic situation in Ukraine and that the crisis in the country could not be overcome by any other means than those which the cabinet of ministers was proposing. Acting Chairman of the Board of the National Bank of Ukraine Boris Markov informed the corps of deputies of the results of the work of the country's main bank and of the problems and complexities of its activity in the conditions of hyperinflation and the huge chronic deficit of the state budget.

Recognizing their own defeat, the majority were not particularly zealous in their noble indignation at the government actions. Tones of sympathy could of course be detected in their speeches and could be heard by dispossessed people who had to pay for the reforms, but the samostiyniki [Ukrainian separatists], smiling with self-satisfaction, did not join in the discussion. Having spoken for several hours, the deputies immediately dispersed.

The main outcome of 20 January will already be evident in Minsk. The Ukrainian president is leaving for the summit of the heads of state of the Commonwealth with his hands untied. No Supreme Soviet resolution will hang over him on the need to sign the CIS Charter. Nevertheless, it should be noted that for the first time in the period of independence a majority in parliament has opposed Kravchuk. This is the first time the Independence Party has had to resort to such tricks.

Vice Premier Views Energy, Fuel Situation

AU1501165893 Kiev MOLOD UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 12 Jan 93 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Yuliy Ioffe, Ukraine's vice prime minister for questions on fuel and energy, by Olena Hubina; place and date not given: "Salvation Must Be Sought in the Production Sphere"]

[Text] Our first interview with Vice Prime Minister Yuliy Ioffe took place literally right after his appointment. At that time, we agreed to return to our conversation at a later date. Having assumed responsibility for our state's almost totally ruined fuel and energy complex, Yuliy Yakovych also became chairman of a special commission dealing with the problems of abuse and violations of the law at enterprises of this complex. The commission has, in fact, completed its work. Ioffe made public many facts at the Supreme Council session. "A detective story"—was the journalists' comment. Pessimistic predictions were immediately voiced: In some traditional way, all "detective stories in our country end in nothing." Will the same thing not happen this time? We asked Vice Prime Minister Yuliy Ioffe about this.

[Hubina] Yuliy Yakovych, your government started with a thankless job: Sorting out the mess left by its predecessors. Some people are saying that this is the wrong approach. Others suggest you are trying to dig until you reach a firm foundation to proceed from. Could you comment?

[Ioffe] I already told you that the present situation in Ukraine brings back memories of a certain aspect of my biography. In 1981, I was appointed director of the Hirska mine, where there had been an explosion. It had been without a director for a whole year; There was total disorder, hard drinking, and violations of safety measures. I had to begin by putting things into elementary order. However, everything there was on a small scale and could somehow be corrected. Now, we have to proceed from something. I was confronted with the fact that I had to do the job, because all of this was happening in the fuel and energy sector. Following the prime minister's first speech, in which he quoted facts, there was much hullabaloo, especially in those places where the relevant factories are situated. It was stressed that the premier had not told the truth.

[Hubina] Did the government feel it was strong enough for such a struggle?

[Ioffe] Each one of us joining the government had to reckon on his own strength. We believe that every one must do his job. On the first days of our commission I asked the Procurator's Office to cooperate with us. However, a strange situation took shape: When [Yuriy] Haysynskyy [chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Council Commission on Glasnost and Mass Media and chairman of the Standing Commission of Ukraine's parliament on checking the activities of the top officials of Ukraine, of bodies of power, public organizations and unions during the abortive coup] sent an expert to our group, [Procurator General Viktor] Shyshkin canceled this directive.

[Hubina] What was the reason for that?

[Ioffe] It is difficult for me to comment. It was probably unwillingness to take such a burden upon himself. For example, in the past, a criminal case was instituted at the recommendation of Yakovyshyn [not further identified]. This time, we accumulated whole volumes listing instances of violation. However, it is not so significant if we manage to investigate individual cases. The main thing is to reveal the mechanism and put it out of

operation. The government has now adopted a number of decrees—on ownership and on small enterprises. These decrees prevent illegal profits. However, it is not our function to investigate crimes. We have finally arrived at an agreement that the Procurator's Office will create a corresponding investigating group. We will equip it with everything it needs. It will operate jointly with the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Security Service.

[Hubina] Did you get the impression that you work in a certain atmosphere of impasse? You say: To put the mechanism out of operation. However, can this actually be done?

[Ioffe] Draconian methods alone will not be effective to stop it. It is necessary to stop up the loopholes with the help of legislation and economic measures, so that there will be no violations. Possibilities for violations were created by our legislation. It might seem we have liberated the enterprises and wanted to create for them a road toward reforms. However, we overlooked the point that the leaders lost motivation to work. It is only human to strive for a better life for oneself. As a result, the leaders [of enterprises] had this motivation: Create a small enterprise, place a relative or somebody at the head of it and make money.

[Hubina] Then it appears that to change the situation today we must also change the laws?

[[Ioffe] Yes, and we are doing this through decrees, for we have been given corresponding powers.

[Hubina] Will it not happen that, by these actions, you will create an opposition among forces that used to support you—industrialists and the directors' corps?

[Ioffe] I believe that honest people will support us. You must not think that absolutely all directors have become swallowed up in abuse. The majority of them are, after all, honest people and one has to realize that in this whole chaos, the entire production is centered around them and depends upon them. However, a few will probably be in opposition, after all, because their personal, and I would say, mercantile, interests have been affected.

[Hubina] How many oil refineries are there in Ukraine today?

[Ioffe] Seven.

[Hubina] And the law is being violated at all of them?

[Ioffe] Almost all.

[Hubina] Therefore, it is possible to say that a certain system was created?

[Ioffe] It was precisely on oil that all those things that could happen anywhere had an exaggerated effect. First, the price of oil on the world market was higher than on the territory of the CIS, as was the case with pipes and metal. Second, there is a ready market. Furthermore, the creation of Ukrnaftokhim [Ukrainian Oil-Chemical Company]—this company has a monopoly on purchasing, selling, and processing oil. Moreover, an incomprehensible structure also took shape: Horyunov was chairman of Ukrnaftokhim and, at the same time, director of the Lysychansk Oil Refinery.

[Hubina] Whose initiative was it to create this company—the government's or the local directors'?

[Ioffe] I do not know—it was before my time. Perhaps, the former government was guided by good intentions; I cannot suspect that its goals were necessarily criminal.

[Hubina] In your report you did not list members of the government among the violators. At the same time, reporters talked about some of them in the lobby.

[Ioffe] I cited facts for which I had documentary evidence. One cannot say absolutely everything one has on one's mind. For example, I gave an interview to ROBITNYCHA HAZETA. They added something and accused, on my behalf, an honest person—people's deputy Eduard Dydorenko. This person was responsible for technologically equipping the Lugansk Militia using the services of both local enterprises and foreign firms. The commission has no facts incriminating him. Therefore, reporters must refrain from making use of fabrications instead of facts.

[Hubina] Your commission has only been in operation one or one and one-half months and, over this time, it has collected facts of abuse that fill up 300 pages. Is it true that these facts were obvious and nobody dealt with them before?

[Ioffe] That's right.

[Hubina] But why?

[Ioffe] The reason lies in the fact that absolute anarchy took shape in our state over the year. All control was lost and irresponsible attitudes prevailed. That became the norm. We lost control, and the laws did not operate.

[Hubina] Can we talk, in this connection, of violations of the law or of advantage being taken of their weakness?

[Ioffe] Generally speaking, weaknesses were exploited. For example, the law on enterprises. We liberated enterprises and prepared them for market relations, but there was no accountability. In a mine, one can simply extract coal without thinking about tomorrow. However, it is necessary to develop the mine and invest in maintenance and modernization. The same applies to any enterprise.

[Hubina] Will it not turn out that the offenders acted within the framework of the law and nobody is legally accountable for the violations?

[Ioffe] That is not so. There have been violations of the law, though in most cases an accountability mechanism was indeed created. I think the Procurator's Office will offer its assessment.

[Hubina] However, so far, we have had to deal with a system in which the results of many such investigations disappeared, as it were, in the sand.

[Ioffe] I do not think that everything disappears into the sand even now. Yevhen Marchuk, chairman of the Security Service, and Valentyn Nedryhaylo, first deputy minister of internal affairs, reported that, on the basis of their investigation, criminal proceedings have been instituted against individual offenders and arrests have been made. We agreed with the Procurator's Office about the creation of two groups: One to take care of the investigation; the other is analytical and Marchuk is responsible for it.

[Hubina] You referred to facts in which the Nadvirnyanskyy and some other refineries had opened hard currency accounts abroad and that many millions [monetary unit not specified] had been deposited there. What will happen to them?

[Ioffe] In accordance with the Supreme Council decree, all hard currency accounts must be returned to Ukrainian territory and taxes must be levied on them here.

[Hubina] As a result of your commission's work, the directors of the Lysychansk, Kremenchuk, and Odessa refineries were dismissed. What is the situation there now?

[Ioffe] Today, acting leaders have been appointed. The Committee for Oil and Gas has been created and it will conclude contracts with all subdivisions. An official selection of cadres will be made.

[Hubina] How much oil is being delivered to these combines?

[Ioffe] At the end of the year, it accounted for between 60 and 70 percent of their needs.

[Hubina] What is the situation now? Agreements already exist but this is not enough. First, it is necessary to agree quotas, and we want to ask Russia for increased deliveries over last year. I pin great hopes upon the president's trip to Moscow. Second, it is necessary to resolve the question of normal monetary relations between Ukraine and Russia.

[Hubina] Does Ukraine receive oil above the quota?

[Ioffe] So far, we have only reached agreement with the Greeks, who purchased oil for hard currency and are leaving gasoline for us.

[Hubina] Russia has repeatedly said that it would sell oil at world prices. Is it realistic for us to "swallow" this in addition to everything else?

[Ioffe] This is very complicated. However, prices will anyway be lower than on the world market. The point is that we do not use much transport or tankers for transporting oil. Pipelines are much cheaper. Today, not a single country gets oil through one channel alone. We, however, are fully dependent upon Russia. That is why any political differences have an effect here. It is true, though, that normal monetary relations with other countries will also be established. Here, salvation must be sought in the production sphere. If we manage to halt its decline, it will function normally and there will be sales to Russia and other countries. Then, money will appear to purchase oil.

[Hubina] To buy oil from other countries we need to specially equip our ports.

[Ioffe] Yes, the technological conditions for a competition to build a terminal in Odessa have already been prepared. We hope things will develop properly.

[Hubina] Today, many scientists are saying that Ukraine itself must take care of the development of its thermal power engineering.

[Ioffe] Yes, we must also consider the possibility of ensuring combustion without fuel oil. Canada has such technology. We will negotiate with that country. We must really proceed from what we have and invest in the coal industry; and make sure that we develop industry that is not energy-intensive. We will adopt laws that make the saving of energy resources profitable.

[Hubina] The government has already adopted a number of decrees to help us improve the situation.

[Ioffe] A decree has already been approved in accordance with which state enterprises cannot be the founders of small enterprises.

[Ioffe] You are therefore optimistic?

[Hubina] Yes, I am an optimist, although I know that the beginning of the year and the spring will be very difficult, until we get going. However, we must work.

Naval Commander Comments on Building New Fleet

LD1701172293 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1545 GMT 17 Jan 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] According to the newspaper EKSPRESS KHRONIKA, about 15,000 people gathered today in Sevastopol for a rally. They were demanding the holding of a referendum on the future of the Crimea and the abolition of a decision preventing it from doing so, which had been made by the local parliament. The rally participants also expressed their concern about the situation of the Black Sea Fleet, which has become a point of disagreement between Russia and Ukraine.

Meanwhile the Ukrainian leadership has also expressed its concern about the affairs at the Fleet. According to Kozhyn, the republican navy commander, the combat readiness of the vessels is at a low level and that there is only around 20 percent of the necessary strategic fuel at the Black Sea Fleet depots.

However, the Ukrainian military is nevertheless optimistic. According to them, an impressive navy program has been devised for the republic. It is scheduled for five years and includes not only the building of surface vessels, but also of submarines and naval aircraft. Earlier Kozhyn expressed his belief that in a short time Ukraine would be able to build a principally new navy, which would include Western vessels.

Rally Demands Return of Sevastopol to Russia

AU2101130993 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 19 Jan 93 p 4

[Oleksandr Pilat report: "An Anti-Ukrainian Rally in Sevastopol"]

[Text] On 17 January, a rally organized by the All-Crimean Movement of Voters for the Crimean Republic was held in Sevastopol. Its slogan was "Back to Russia." O. Kruglov, chairman of the Sevastopol committee of the "National Salvation Front," said that even if a confederation or federation of Slavic republics is created, "Sevastopol must be a constituent part of Russia." He also called L. Kravchuk "the president who is hated in Sevastopol." Chairman of the City Council V. Semenov and presidential representative I. Yermakov participated in the rally. Yermakov tried to change the course of the rally, but the crowd did not allow him to speak.

The rally appealed to the leaders and citizens of Russia, Ukraine, and the Crimean Republic and to the command of the Black Sea Fleet with a statement: "Sevastopol was, is, and will be a Russian military base."

The resolution adopted by the rally highlighted the need for the Crimean Supreme Council to cancel the moratorium on the referendum on the independence of the peninsula. It was proposed that the City Council form a delegation to Russia at its next session that will be authorized to negotiate securing Sevastopol's status as part of the Russian Federation and also see to it that all Ukrainian flags in the city be replaced with the flags of the Russian Federation and the Crimean Republic.

Press Center Denies Ostankino Report on Nuclear Dump

AU1901152093 Kiev MOLOD UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 15 Jan 93 p 2

[Report by Ukraine's Independent Information Agency RESPUBLIKA from Simferopol: "Yet Another Lie From 'Ostankino'"]

[Text] Recently, the Ostankino Television and Radio Broadcasting Company spread a report to the effect that a dump containing nuclear weapons of the Black Sea Fleet is located 15 kilometers from the town of Saky. The Press Center of the Black Sea Fleet stated that the facility referred to by the Ostankino Television and Radio Broadcasting Company has nothing to do with the fleet and that no nuclear weapons are stored on the territory of Saky Rayon.

Inspectorate Created To Combat Military Corruption

LD1501181093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1355 GMT 15 Jan 93

[By UKRINFORM-TASS]

[Text] Kiev January 15—The Ukrainian minister of defense, Colonel-General Konstantyn Morozov, has issued a decree creating the main inspectorate.

The goal of the inspectorate, which will include lawyers, financiers, supply officers and quartermasters, is to organize an effective battle against corruption, the stealing of military property, the misuse of offical or work positions and other violations in the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

Belarus

Shushkevich Meeting Achieves 'Full Mutual Understanding'

OW1901193693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1805 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A meeting between parliamentary speaker Stanislav Shushkevich and representatives from different deputies' fractions has resulted in "full mutual understanding and agreement on all issues." This was the view expressed by Gennadiy Kozlov, who is first deputy head of the government's National Security Department, after the meeting which took place in Minsk November 18. Kozlov is co-ordinator of the deputies' association "Belarus".

Kozlov said that the meeting had taken place within the framework of preparations for the next round of the parliamentary sessions which resumes Tuesday [19 January] after the Christmas vacation. He said that the two sides had for over two hours discussed primarily difficulties with composing the session's agenda.

Kozlov said that Shushkevich had also spoken highly in favour of the state being the principle landowner in Belarus. The head of parliament had also proposed Petr Mitko for the post of deputy speaker of parliament. Mitko had, to date, held the post of chairman of the parliamentary commiission for family affairs and youth.

IF [INTERFAX] Note: According to current legislation, the Head of Parliament has the right to propose candidates to deputies for approval.

The "Belarus" representatives did not reveal their attitude to Shushkevich with relation to the possible appointment of Petr Mitko, resolving first of all to discuss this at a meeting of all members of the "Belarus" deputies' association.

IF Note: "Belarus" is the largest in the republic's parliament. It consists of over 120 parliamentarians making it, in the opinion of local experts, the most influential today.

Shushkevich Gives Qualified Approval to CIS Statutes

LD2001185593 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0400 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] The meeting in Minsk will take place, Stanislav Shushkevich, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belarus, has told journalists. As for problems that could arise at it, their existence does not at all mean their insolubility. In the view of the Belarusian leader, one should not class as insoluble difficult issues which arise in relation to the CIS in a number of member states of the Commonwealth.

As for the statutes of the CIS, Shushkevich underlined that he has been authorized by the Supreme Soviet of Belarus to sign all its clauses apart from the articles concerning the issues of collective security. At the same time, the chairman of the Belarusian parliament did not rule out that procedures will be found which make it possible to reach a variant of the statues of the Commonwealth which will be signed by all.

Kebich Says CIS Countries 'Need Each Other'

LD2001190593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1830 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By BELINFORM correspondent Valentina Menshikova for TASS]

[Text] Minsk January 20 TASS—"A relatively short, but a very complicate period of time which elapsed since the emergence of the Commonwealth of Independent States has convincingly proved that attempts to bar from each other lead to nothing but the detriment to national economies," Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich said in an interview with newspaper RESPUBLIKA on Wednesday [20 January].

"I believe that many have realised this. We need each other, moreover, we desperately need each other," he added.

According to the Belarusian prime minister, "it is necessary to develop flexible forms of relations, signing both multilateral and bilateral agreements. "In the long run it is not ruled out that these relations might become a key for the solution of problems which are vitally important for all CIS countries and republics of the former Soviet Union," he said.

Supreme Soviet Panel Chairman on CIS Minsk Summit

PM2101111193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 20 Jan 93 First Edition p 7

[Unattributed report under the "CIS" rubric: "'Man Does Not Live By Sovereignty Alone'"]

[Text] "Man does not live by sovereignty alone." That is what Mikhail Slemnev, chairman of the Belarus Supreme Soviet Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations, said when giving his opinion on the forthcoming meeting of CIS heads of state and governments in Minsk.

It can be categorically stated right now that our republic will not be able to develop outside the Commonwealth's borders, he stressed.

Kebich 'Personally Responsible' for Currency Expenditures

OW1501212593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1835 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "Belarus will aim to borrow credit from foreign partners for specific economic programmes aimed primarily for the export of products," Vladimir Radkyevich, the prime minister's chief foreign economic expert and chairman of the republic's State Foreign Economic Relations Committee. Radkyevich stressed that the government did not intend to spend the republic's hard currency reserves on "clearly unprofitable programmes."

Radkyevich said that Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich was personally responsible for all matters concerning hard currency expenditure in Belarus. "Not one dollar," he said, "leaves the republic's treasury without the knowledge of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers" after the State Hard Currency Committee was set up.

Radkyevich said that the republic's priorities in the development of its foreign economic activity included the resolution already passed on setting up a quota and licensing department within the State Committee. Kebich and Radkyevich had envisaged that this body should guarantee a "centralised and controlled" procedure for the issue of export licenses. Licenses, the expert pointed out, had until recently been issued by "too many different organisations," including municipal and regional authorities.

This, in his opinion, was what had led to competition among foreign firms to trade in Belarusian goods. He said that information in his possession indicated that this had brought about a fall in prices for Belarusian products in several countries and had caused the amount of hard currency entering the republic to dwindle.

Radkyevich spoke in favour of reducing the amount of barter transactions for goods which were competitive on the world market. The prime minister already has in his possession a list of such goods. Barter in strategically important goods, such as oil and timber, would now be carried out only with the permission of Vice-Premier Nikolay Kostikov, who is responsible for issues relating to the material, technical and raw material supply in Belarus.

The chairman of the State Committee announced that the cabinet of ministers did not intend to favour any one specific Western nation for the development of collaboration. He said, however, that the biggest turnover was with Poland (around 20%) and Austria (6-7%). Next came Switzerland, Germany and the USA. The republic had, to date, concluded foreign economic business arrangements with 12 foreign nations, with India, Switzerland and Germany soon to be added to that list. The prime minister himself plans to travel to these nations to sign the agreements.

Radkyevich also said that the State Committee was currently looking into the possibility of setting up a business centre in Minsk. Specialists said that this would take the form of a complex of hotels, conference halls and offices for representatives of firms from abroad. The plan would cost, preliminary estimates say, around 150 bn. [billion] dollars. Radkyevich considered that if the plan were to be approved by the government, all of the credit granted by Germany and part of that granted by Austria would have to be spent on it. He was, nevertheless, convinced of the project's expediency.

Economic Improvement Becoming 'A Stable Trend'

PM2001091993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jan 93 First Edition p 7

[Aleksey Yeroshenko report: "Becoming Familiar with the Rules of Play"]

[Text] Minsk—At the end of the exhausting year of 1992 sovereign Belarus showed the world a kind of sign—industrial production had not only pulled out of its death spin but also exceeded the previous year's results. The machine building complex increased 2.6 percent, the timber and woodworking complex 2 percent, and the food complex 3 percent. There is still quite a long way to go until full stabilization, but the improvement in the economic situation has acquired the features of a stable trend—sectors have managed to adapt to the tough rules of reform, groping for a way out of the economic crisis.

Statistical reports also convince the republic's population that their living standards are certainly envied in many corners of the CIS. True, the prices marathon last fall was on the point of sowing doubt that their own government was sincerely concerned about its people. But the 8 billion ruble [R] monthly subsidies on food restored the shaken trust in the authorities. Indeed, where else is it possible to buy good-quality boiled sausage without any speculation for R170, or 1 kg of butter for R240? At R6, a liter of milk or a tub of cottage cheese is 40 percent of the cost of an empty bottle. There are no problems with bread either. Pay R11 to the cashier, and a 500-gram sliced loaf made from wheat flour is yours. The beef situation is difficult at present, and prices are comparable with Ukrainian and Latvian prices, but they still have a long, long way to go to reach Moscow, Kaliningrad, or Kazakhstan prices.

The topic of citizens' social protection does not leave the agenda of Supreme Soviet sessions either. The adoption of the law on pension provision for servicemen, guaranteeing them a 70-percent supplement for long service, may be considered a Christmas gift. The minimum wage of other working people has been raised to R3,000.

The drop in living standards has not yet acquired a wholesale nature also because there are still state guarantees in the spheres of education and medical services. It is these that help people to keep their spirits up.

Sociological research into the subject "What will you do if the political and economic situation in the republic deteriorates in the future?" attests to the Belarusian people's composure and patience. More than 17 percent of those polled are prepared to wait for better times, 39 percent will try to take care of themselves, and 25 percent will do as the majority. Few people put their trust in the various political forces emerging in the republic and seeking to replace the existing leadership by means of a reelection. No more than 8 percent are prepared to side with them. Still fewer—just 3.4 percent—would, maybe, venture to leave this land poisoned by Chernobyl, which is, nonetheless, their homeland.

It does not seem at all likely that the gloomy predictions of local prophets about a threat of civil war could come true. Just 3.8 percent of hotheads are not averse to supporting organizations which would undertake to change the situation for the better by armed means.

Government Forms Committee To Regulate Quotas, Licensing

WS2001133693 Minsk BELINFORM in Russian 0956 GMT 16 Jan 93

[Text] Belarus is introducing unified rules on import and export licensing and quotas. The Department for Non-Tariff Regulation has been established at the Belarusian State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations for this purpose. This is the first interview of Viktor Pasko, head of the new structure, for the press.

"The decision to establish the new committee was adopted by the Belarusian Council of Ministers as far back as the end of 1992. It was evoked by the necessity of regulating foreign trade with all countries, including the republics of the former USSR.

The imports and exports of goods is carried out with or without licenses from our committee. All goods pass the customs procedures without exception. The committee is working to simplify of all procedures. It will be possible to shorten the list of licensed goods and mediating ministries and departments. Our goal is to simplify the arrangement of all documents necessary for the customs control. We intend to simplify all customs procedures for raw materials and cooperative supplies. We are going to control goods supplied according to intergovernment agreements.

Foreign Ministry Structurally Reorganized

OW1501215893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1708 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The reorganisation of the Belarusian foreign ministry is to include the formation of a group of special ambassadors from the republic's corpus of experienced diplomats. Diplomatic Panorama received this information from Belarusian Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Sychev, who said that appointments were already being made.

One such appointment is Gennadiy Bartoshyevich, formerly Second Secretary of the Belarusian Communist Party's Central Committee where he was responsible for staffing, and subsequently Soviet Ambassador to the Korean Democratic People's Republic.

Another is the diplomat Stanislav Ogurtsov, who is responsible for the delimitation and demarcation of the state border between Belarus and Lithuania.

Moldova

Parliament Discusses Snegur's Referendum Proposal

OW1901164893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1452 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The session of the Moldovan parliament resumed work, after the Christmas break, on Tuesday [19 January] in Chisinau. The deputies resumed discussion of the December statement of President Mircea Snegur on the necessity of a referendum to decide the question of the republic's independence.

Explaining his statement, the President noted, in particular, that "it's is necessary to consult the people and to put an end to the rumors about the unification with Romania."

The deputies passed a decision to discuss several draft resolutions of the President's statement in factions and deputy groups until the end of the day.

The parliament's plenary sessions are to continue on Wednesday, January 20.

Factions, Opponents Comment

OW1901193493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1808 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Moldovan parliament on Tuesday [19 January] asked for a debate on the proposal made by President Mircea Snegur December 24 on consulting the nation about Moldova's status and an end to rumours about unification with Romania. Snegur's proposal was

backed by independent deputies and a group of landowners from the deputies' corpus. The deputies proposed holding a referendum on the above issue before March 1st.

The landowners held citizens' assemblies during the Christmas vacation. Dmitriy Motfan, the leader of the landowners' fraction, told INTERFAX that these assemblies had established that the nation "supported the idea of a referendum, since it was concerned more by political uncertainty than by economic difficulties and high prices."

At the same time, the opponents of the referendum, in the form of the Christian Democratic National Front, organised a congress of members of the intelligentsia in Chisinau. These members of the intelligentsia had proposed full integration with Romania and were against the idea of a referendum on "non-unification with our Romanian brothers."

Parliament's speaker Alexandru Mosanu stated that Snegur's speech in December had been an "apple of discord" cast at parliament and society. The speaker said that he would use all manner of force available to him to campaign against a referendum, the holding of which "could not clarify the issue and would only bring added complications."

Snegur himself, who had also taken advantage of the parliamentary recess to visit several of the republic's regions, had re-enforced his belief that "the majority of Moldovans sincerely wished to see the creation of an independent state and were against any kind of unification with any other state." He said that this had been the main result of his journeying around the republic and proposed the main articles of the new constitution of an independent Moldova for referendum as a compromissary option.

Political observers were of the view that this would be unlikely to satisfy the referendum's opponents. It would not be difficult to forsee that an implacable conflict between fractions would unfurl in parliament with renewed vigour. Local observers do not rule out the fact that continued relative equilibrium between political opponents could result in the situation where parliament could be paralysed and be unable to reach any decision.

Speaker Criticizes Proposal

OW1901211093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1957 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chairman of the Moldovan Supreme Council Alexandru Mosanu, appearing Tuesday [19 January] at a parliamentary session, categorically rejected the idea of conducting a referendum on independence, which President Mircea Snegur proposed in a statement before the new year. The speaker believes that if the referendum is conducted, it "will be of an anti-Romanian nature," and will cast doubt on the prospects of the further development of ties between Chisinau and Romania, and legitimize the consequences of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.

Having spoken in favor of further economic integration with Romania, Mosanu stressed that right now Moldova's economy depends completely on Russia, and Chisinau "is unable to conduct independent economic policy." Therefore, he feels they must leave the CIS and not allow documents on Moldova's membership in the Commonwealth to be ratified. "The imperialistic, aggressive, chauvinist circles of Russia, which want to put us under their subordination, pose the greatest danger to the republic," said the speaker. Mosanu announced his plans to get the Fourteenth Russian Army out of the republic.

In response to the speaker's complaints, President Mircea Snegur called the criticisms groundless. "I will stick to my former positions," he told deputies, "and I know that the people support that stance. I will remain the legal president, by a general election through constitutional means. And I ask you to take this into consideration."

'Rupture' Between President, Parliament

AU2001194693 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1820 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] Chisinau, ROMPRES, 20/1/93—The ROMPRES special correspondent in Chisinau Iosif Dumitrascu has conveyed the following commentary on the political state of things in the Republic of Moldova:

The rupture between the Presidency of Moldova and its legislative body seems to have deepened, especially after the declaration made in the Republic's Parliament by President Mircea Snegur on 24 December last year (when he suggested that parliament should decide whether or not a referendum be held on the independence of this former Romanian province—editor's note). This is the opinion shared these days by various circles in the Moldavian capital. As far as the relations between the president of the Republic Mircea Snegur and the President of Moldova's Parliament Alexandru Mosanu are concerned, they seem to have come to a split due to divergent views on whether or not a referendum be called.

In the Moldovan Parliament's sitting of 19 January, Mr. Mosanu spoke about the republic's need for a real independence, and underlined the extremely nefarious role played by the Russian 14th Army, deployed in the territory of Moldova as occupation troops, about which its commander, General Lebed, said it could not be removed sooner than 5-10 years from now. Mr. Mosanu disagrees with the accusations brought against "unionists" and other forces that do nothing but act in the support of a process which is logical and therefore impending, that is the union of the Romanians on either banks of the Prut in one single state.

The leadership of the Republic of Moldova regarded with an evil eye the recent Congress of the Moldovan Intellectuals, which pronounced neither against the government, nor against the president of the republic, it just voiced its intention to achieve an organizational force proportionate to its strength and to regain the place in society it deserves. This came as a reaction to recent "opinions", some of them issued by the highest circles of the power, trying to minimize and even to denigrate the efforts of progressist intelligentsia.

Parliament Rejects Referendum

AU2101124493 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0835 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 21/4/1993—With 166 votes for of the 167 needed, the quorum the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova rejected on January 20 the idea of a referendum on that republic's status.

Alexandru Mosanu, Speaker of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova, said in his address that to hold a referendum at this time "could have an anti-Romanian character" and could estrange that republic from Romania, pushing it "into" the CIS.

"The plebiscite would shake the Republic of Moldova's independence and would destabilize the situation, meaning precisely the legislation of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact," Alexandru Mosanu added. The idea of a referendum was sustained by the Russian-speaking parliamentarians and the conservatives of the"village life" group, the daily notes.

Correspondents report that the debates were very noisy and proceeded "in a very tense atmosphere," with pressures put on deputies during voting. Upon the request of the group of the Christian Democratic People's Front, the vote was nominal. Also, the parliamentarians were invited not to express a personal option through their ballot but take account of their position as "elected of the people, with a clear and open option for those who elected them."

The 166 ballots cast for the referendum are not enough to start its organization, so the Russian-speaking and agrarian parliamentarians were short of just one ballot in the materialization of their idea.

Military Cooperation Agreement Signed With Ukraine

OW1801203093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1847 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chisinau has initialed a military cooperation agreement between Moldova and Ukraine.

"The relations between our two countries have always been warm and friendly, and they will remain so in the future," the Ukrainian First Deputy Defense Minister Ivan Byzhan said after signing the document. "Under our military doctrines, we will organize our armed forces so that they would pose no threat to any other party," he emphasized.

'Neighborly Relations' Stressed

OW1901155193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1443 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Moldova is interested in neighborly relations with Romania and Ukraine as well as other neighboring states. The Moldovan Defence Minister, General Pavel Creanga, told INTERFAX that, after initialling a treaty on military cooperation with Ukraine, cooperation will amount primarily to exchanges of information on the situation on the border and in air space. Contracts are expected to be signed on the training of officers for Moldova in Ukraine, and on the repairs of military equipment there.

According to the Ukrainian deputy Defence Minister Colonel General Ivan Byzhan, the doctrine of the Ukrainian army is based on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. The Ukrainian armed forces are ready to cooperate with all neighbors and pose no threat to them, he said.

Presidential Adviser Anticipating Talks With Tiraspol

OW1901164793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1453 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chisinau and Tiraspol are to continue their dialogue and future search for a common language, according to Nicolae Kirtaoke, State Advisor to the Moldovan President, who was speaking to INTERFAX Tuesday [19 January]. Kirtaoke was summing up the second round of talks between an official Moldovan delegation and representatives of the local Tiraspol government on the resolution of the transdniesterian conflict. This round of talks took place in Bendery Monday last.

Kirtaoke said that proposals by both sides for continued special status to be granted to Transdniestr by Chisinau and the Tiraspol option of forming a Moldovan Confederation were heard. Agreement for a joint commission to prepare documents highlighting any shortcomings in these options was reached.

"A sense of optimism is conveyed by the fact that the commission has concluded that the matter concerns the transdniesterian region of Moldova and its special status, and guarantees to the region in the event Moldova's state organization alters. The matter does not concern a Moldovan Confederation," the state advisor said. He was of the view that "the process of rapprochement essential for both sides has begun."

Kazakhstan

Armenian Delegation Visits; Cooperation Treaties Signed

LD1901144793 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Jan 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] We have just received via satellite link a report by our correspondent on a visit by Armenia's president to Kazakhstan.

[Correspondent D. Baimbetov] The government delegation was headed by Armenia's President Levon Ter-Petrosyan. After his one-on-one conversation with Kazakhstan's President Nursultan Nazarbayev, talks took place in which other leaders of the two states participated. Nazarbayev noted that Kazakhstan will continue its peace-making activities and will do all it can to extinguish the Karabakh conflict. The presidents signed a treaty on the foundations of relations between Kazakhstan and Armenia.

Meanwhile, the two prime ministers, Sergey Tereshchenko and Khosrov Aruntyunyan, drew up the legal basis for another treaty on trade and economic cooperation. A document on financial interrelations was also signed. Turkmen gas passes through Kazakhstan's territory to Armenia. Therefore, there was also discussion about all of the vitally important fuel getting to Armenia and not being intercepted anywhere.

Kazakhstan intends helping this Transcaucasian republic with foodstuffs, in the first instance with grain and meat.

At a press conference which took place afterwards, the sides stressed that cooperation between the two republics will also cover other cultural, scientific, and ecological spheres and that of public health.

Nazarbayev Meets Ter-Petrosyan

NC2001093893 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1300 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] We have just received an ARMENPRES report on the official contacts in Alma-Ata. Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan, who is on a brief working visit to Kazakhstan's capital, held a 45-minute private meeting with Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev on 18 January. The Armenian presidential press service reported that the meeting discussed economic cooperation between the two countries and the peaceful resolution of the Karabakh conflict within a CSCE framework.

Armenian Prime Minister Khosrov Arutyunyan met Kazakh Prime Minister Sergey Tereshchenko and signed an agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the two countries for 1993.

Presidents Levon Ter-Petrosyan and Nursultan Nazarbayev will hold a news conference today.

[Moscow INTERFAX in English at 1450 GMT on 19 January adds the following: "Kazakhstan and Armenia on Tuesday [19 January] signed an agreement in Alma-Ata on the terms for collaboration between the two, an economic trade agreement, and documents relating to financial relations. Kazakh and Armenian presidents Nursultan Nazarbayev and Levon Ter-Petrosyan also reached agreements on the supply of meat and 200,000 tons of grain to Armenia, although 450,000 tons were originally requested. The heads of states said that prices would be agreed on at the ministerial level.

["Alma-Ata and Yerevan also passed a resolution to set up joint textile enterprises on Kazakh territory. These enterprises will, on Nazarbayev's proposal, use Kazakh raw materials and Armenian equipment. A working group will be formed to develop the project in full."]

Armenian Delegation Holds Negotiations

LD1901183693 Alma-Ata Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 1500 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Excerpt] The state delegation of Armenia headed by President Levon Ter-Petrosyan arrived in Alma-Ata last night for an official visit. Today they had negotiations with the government, the national bank, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other departments of the republic. During the visit, talks took place between Presidents Nursultan Nazarbayev and Levon Ter-Petrosyan in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and trust.

In the course of negotiations the political and economic situations of both countries were discussed. Ways of developing bilateral relations were also considered. The considerable role of the mediatory mission of Kazakhstan and Russia in the settlement of the Karabakh conflict, through which it became possible to commence the dialogue between Armenia and Azerbaijan, was pointed out.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan assured that his country does not intend to withdraw from the CIS. It retains the basic principles and the will to remain a devoted adherent to the Commonwealth.

Regarding the problems of the situation in Karabakh, Nursultan Nazarbayev stressed that Kazakhstan came forward with its mediatory mission out of humanitarian principles, being anxious for the fate of the peoples drawn into conflict. He declared his readiness to continue peace-making efforts under CSCE auspices.

The official negotiations of the delegations then took place. Afterwards, the agreement on the basis of mutual relations between the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Republic of Armenia was concluded and signed by the presidents. The document stressed that both sides will follow the aims and principles of the UN charter and the Helsinki Final Act.

Prime Ministers Sergey Tereshchenko and Khosrov Aruntyunyan signed the agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the republics for the year 1993. An agreement on the procedure in debt obligation on mutual payments for the last year was also concluded. [passage omitted]

President Addresses Parliament on Russia, Economy

LD1901195193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1933 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By KAZTAG correspondent Vladimir Akimov]

[Text] Alma-Ata January 19 TASS—Rules of the game the Kazakh government "was forced to accept on the Russian government dictate have not justified themselves," believes Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev.

Both governments "gave preference to the stake on economic liberalization with simultaneous stabilization of the monetary- financial system. However, last year showed it is simply impossible to achieve the goals in a relatively short period of time," Nazarbayev told the current parliament session in Alma-Ata.

In the president's opinion, the republic should now focus on curbing the recession of production and consumption, provide for financial stabilization and exclude crisis phenomena from the consumption branches. If these circumstances are further ignored, this will mean deliberate course towards frontal bankruptcy of enterprises, huge unemployment and further sharp impoverishment of the people.

The president expressed his clear support to the parliament- considered state program of emergency anti-crisis measures and deepening of social and economic reforms. He called to enhance the role of state in economic regulation and for the revival of planning.

In the president's opinion, many current troubles are "caused by our inability or unwillingness to rationally doze [word as received] state and market principles, combine them and gradually exclude excessive state principles with beginning market ones.

"Stage-by-stage reforming of the previous management system on the basis of rationalization is more constructive than crucial breaking", he said, noting the reforming should use all best features of the previous management system, including industriousness, mutual-dependency and co-subordination, to gradually subordinate all the best to new requirements of economic practice.

Defines Priorities for Developing Economy

OW1801190693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1510 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev told parliament Tuesday [as received] that priority in the republic would be given to the development of the fuel and energy and metallurgical complexes, consumer sector industries, and communications. The development of these areas, the president said, was the "most important pre-requisite for the reformation of the economy."

Nazarbayev told parliamentarians that the government had worked out a new privatisation policy which envisaged the de- nationalisation both of small and large industrial installations. Privatisation in agriculture, he said, was progressing "with a degree of difficulty." The president emphasised that the dates for the reorganisation of enterprises with debts outstanding should be established, as should the dates for the repayment of these debts. If these conditions were not observed, he said, "stock belonging to these enterprises would be auctioned off."

Regarding reform in the banking sector, Nazarbayev pointed out that "banks had recently broken away from heavy industry and were now engaging in "speculative trading" instead of financing major investment programmes. He proposed that the chairman of the National Bank become a member of the government and be released from his accountability to parliament.

Proposes Strengthening 'Supreme Executive Power'

OW1801132793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1143 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Monday Nursultan Nazarbayev, the Kazakh President, made a proposal to the parliament to reshuffle and to strengthen the supreme executive power. Addressing the parliamentarians, he explained the necessity of these structural rearrangements by "an enormous swelling of the government apparatus." The President underlined that "the parallelism in the supreme structures of power and at the regional levels hinders the reforms and gives birth to bureaucracy." According to the Kazakh President, the ministries and state committees should become the central link governing the economy.

The parliament approved 8 candidates to the supreme governing posts in the republic, presented by the President. Askhat Zhabagin [name as received] was appointed the first deputy Prime Minister of Kazakhstan, on general issues.

Nazarbayev pointed out that all the new leaders proposed by him "are supporters of market economy," and asked the parliament to preserve the deputies mandates of the newly appointed ministers until the term of their authority expires.

Government Makes Cabinet Changes

LD2001005693 Alma-Ata KAZTAG in Russian 1100 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Summary] The Supreme Soviet of Kazakhstan, meeting on 18 January, approved the following cabinet changes:

Asygat Zhabagin: deputy prime minister;
Kuanysh Sultanov: deputy prime minister;
Galym Abilsiitov: deputy prime minister and minister of science and new technologies;
Zhanibek Karibzhanov: deputy prime minister and chairman of the State Committee for State Property.

The following ministers have been brought into the government:

Yerkeshbay Derbisov: finance;
Beysenbay Izteleuov: economy;
Albert Salamatin: industry;
Petr Svoik: chairman of the State Committee for Antimonopoly Policy.

President Nzarbayev issued a decree making the following appointments:

K. Karabatovich Baykenov: minister of energy and fuel resources;
Baltash Moldabayevich Tursumbayev: minister of agriculture.
M. Zholdasbekov has been released from his job as deputy prime minister; he moves to another job. K.S. Izbaskhanov has been released from his job as chairman of the State Committee for State Property; he moves to another job.

Report on Parliamentary Sessions 19 Jan

LD2001133593 Alma-Ata Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 1500 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] Parliament started its work today by discussing the draft law on the republic's economic reform fund. Having heard and discussed the information given by First Deputy Prime Minister Daulet Sembayev, the people's deputies decided to have the draft law revised. Then the Supreme Kenges returned on the draft law on universal military obligation, military and alternative service which was adopted article by article. After having introduced the proposed amendments it was approved in full.

At the evening session, (Leonid Dogayev), deputy chairman of the National Security Committee, made a speech on the draft law on defense of the republic's state secrets. The law was approved article by article. They then began to approve the law on the status and social security of servicemen and members of their family [words indistinct].

Nazarbayev Ready To Sign Documents at CIS Minsk Summit

OW1901160893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1450 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev has said that the threat of the CIS splitting up at the forthcoming summit of heads of state in Minsk was not a real one. Kazakhstan, moreover, was fully prepared to sign all documents prepared for the summit, he announced at a press conference in Alma-Ata Tuesday [19 January] after the talks between Kazakhstan and Armenia.

Nazarbayev stressed that he would once again raise the issue of CIS unity at the summit. He also expressed his disappointment that many of the resolutions passed at the last summit were not being fulfilled. Kazakhstan, he said, would again propose the formation of a CIS Economic Court to ensure that resolutions passed were carried out. The court would be able to approve sanctions against any violators of agreements signed." [no open quotation marks as received]

Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan pointed out that current negotiations between Kazakhstan and Armenia and the agreements signed "would be a solid base for the future stimulation of unifying processes within the framework of the CIS." He said that Kazakhstan had a "major role" to play in halting the processes of disintegration in the CIS.

The Armenian president expressed the hope that Kazakhstan would not "empty her hands" and would continue to apply all efforts to find a solution to the Karabakh conflict within the framework of the CIS. He pointed out that the "Yeltsin-Nazarbayev mission" had not produced the necessary results, but had indicated that "this mechanism for resolving conflicts was, in theory, a viable one."

Levon Ter-Petrosyan praised the meeting between the leaders of the Central Asian states which recently took place in Tashkent with the purpose of stimulating regional co-operation and expressed the hope that a meeting on the above would take place in the Caucuses. In his opinion, such a meeting could be attended by Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and other Caucasian states.

Nazarbayev Appoints New Press, Media Minister

LD2101032293 Alma-Ata Kazakh Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jan 93

[Text] By a decree of the president of the Republic of Kazakhstan Altynbek Sarsenbay-Ulu Sarsenbayev has been appointed as minister for press and media of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

More on Signing of Agreements With Tajikistan

PM1501144793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jan 93 p 2

[Vladimir Ardayev report: "Kazakhstan Will Help Its Neighbor"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—An official delegation from Tajikistan led by Supreme Soviet Chairman I. Rakhmonov and republic head of government A. Abdullodzhanov spent two days in Alma-Ata.

N. Nazarbayev and I. Rakhmonov signed an interstate agreement on the fundamental principles of cooperation between Tajikistan and Kazakhstan. The negotiations and the signing took place at the Kazakhstan president's home, as he is sick with a high temperature. A. Abdullodzhanov and Kazakhstan Premier S. Tereshchenko signed a commercial and economic agreement and an agreement on granting credit to Tajikistan. In addition, N. Nazarbayev gave an assurance that humanitarian aid will be granted to Tajikistan consisting of yurts, tents, medicines, and foodstuffs.

Kyrgyzstan

Government Says CIS Must Define 'Ideology of Relations'

OW1901181093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1719 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "In its present shape the Commonwealth of Independent States suits no one. It does nothing to promote the interests of its members; the system is in a deadlock," Kyrgyzstan's Foreign Minister, Ednan Karabayev, told DP [Diplomatic Panorama]. It's necessary to work out a concept to serve as the program of activity for all member countries, he said.

According to him, as the United Nations organization, the CIS is not in a position to resolve concrete problems; it must only define "the ideology of relations" between its member states. It can take concrete decisions only in the military area and in the field of collective security, said the Kyrgyz foreign minister.

According to Karabayev, the lack of compromises between CIS countries has resulted in "emasculating" the draft of the CIS Charter, and in making it unsuitable for many member states.

Akayev Criticizes Government, Stresses Emergency Measures

OW1801212193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1704 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's transition to world prices in accounting with the former Soviet republics and the contents of the recent high-level meeting between Russia and Ukraine are witness to the impossibility of achieving constructive economic liaison within the framework of the CIS. This was the point of view expressed at a meeting in the ministry for economics and finance by President Askar Akayev. Akayev emphasised the necessity of adopting a rigid line based on the republic's real opportunities and the "trump cards" which it possessed before the CIS summit in Minsk January 22.

The Kyrgyz leader considered that the CIS and the Central Asian Commonwealth (the Tashkent agreement between the four Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan) were essential to maintain political stability in the former USSR and the prevention of armed conflicts. "There will be no collaboration either in the CIS or in Central Asia in the economic sense since each state is looking after its own interests," Akayev stated.

He subjected the law passed by parliament on this year's budget to harsh criticism. The budget, he said, "is inadequate and must be completely reviewed by the government." 360 bn [billion] dollars are required for the import of oil and gas this year alone taking into account the transition to world prices, the head of state estimated.

President Akayev was of the view that the expertise of the economics and finance ministry had not yet begun to correspond with the department's intended role. This, he said, was "to serve as the headquarters for the nationwide economy, the conductor of all programmes and activity, and the forecaster of what the situation would be like a month or a year ahead." The president said that he had heard nothing constructive from the ministry's specialists at the meeting and had been "disappointed" with its content. "The forecast (by the ministry's experts) for 1993 has no justification whatsoever and those leaders who made the forecast ought to resign," Akayev said. The ministry, he said, "is lagging behind events and has demonstrated complete helplessness and the incapability of formulating the necessary preventative measures to alleviate the consequences of the transition to world prices and the fall in dependence on energy and grain exports."

The president considered that there was no time to engage in macroeconomics and that this year a minimum 10-15 practical projects must be put into effect in order to save the situation. Akayev said that he was losing hope

of being able to come out of the crisis in the face of the lack of responsibility before the nation displayed by the economics and finance ministry's leadership.

The president later at an emergency cabinet meeting ordered ministers to come up with a package of emergency measures for the economy within one week. [sentence as received] The republic's leadership also intends to call an emergency session of parliament to approve these documents and the granting of additional and necessary powers to the government.

Akayaev stressed that if the government did not undertake these emergency measures as soon as ever possible, there would be the threat of collapse. He described the government's efforts in 1992 as "very poor." He drew attention to statistics which, according to the economic indicators for last year, the republic was falling behind "warring Armenia" and "even Tajikistan".

The main condition for the exit from crisis, he said, was guaranteeing law and order in the name of the preservation of social and political stability. Crime, he said, was on the increase, and corruption, drugs dealing, and speculation were all flourishing. "Corruption in state state bodies had assumed a threatening character. Bribery has become the norm in the functioning of whole government institutions." The president was in possession of information about the appearance of illegal armed units. The formation of these units, he said, had not been opposed by the law and order enforcememnt bodies. "If these bodies pay no attention to the formation of these units, then perhaps they themselves are creating them and, perhaps, are creating them in opposition to the president," Akayev surmised.

The president demanded an end to political intrigue and the badgering of the president. These, he said, were being conducted with the assistance of populist tendencies. Akayev warned "the president has his own party and, if the need were to arise, he knows what forces he can depend on."

Akayev Says Constructive Cooperation With CIS 'Impossible'

OW1501224393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1937 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev maintains that constructive economic cooperation is impossible in the framework of the CIS because each CIS country is seeking to uphold its own interests. In addressing the participants of the meeting at the Economics and Finance Ministry in Bishkek, he substantiated his point by referring to Russia's decision to adopt international prices in its trade accounting with the republics of the former Soviet Union. Also indicative of this, in the words of Askar Akayev, is the meeting in Moscow between Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk.

Before the opening of the CIS summit in Minsk on January 22, the Kyrgyz President wants the republic to work out its strong position, "proceeding from its resources and the strong points it has."

Mr Akayev reasoned that the Commonwealth in the framework of the former Soviet Union, as well as the Central Asian Commonwealth are only needed for securing political stability of their member countries, insuring their collective security, preventing local armed conflicts and curbing their spread to the territory of the entire CIS.

Tajikistan's Rakhmonov Comments on Border Dispute

OW1501044793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1903 GMT 14 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan on Thursday [14 January] signed an international relations treaty in Bishkek. No agreement was reached on border issues at talks between delegations led by the Tajik and Kyrgyz parliamentary speakers, Imamali Rakhmonov and Medetkan Sherimkulov.

The Kyrgyz speaker was of the view that a treaty was needed to consolidate the inviolability of the existing borders. Therefore, the inclusion of the text of this as part of the formation of an interstate commission for border issues insisted on by the Tajik side was "unacceptable" to Bishkek.

IF [INTERFAX] Note: On arrival in Bishkek, I. Rakhmonov told INTERFAX that he considered the strengthening of historical links and good relations between the two republics essential. He stressed that the current border dispute between Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan must be resolved constructively and without allowing previous territorial claims to obstruct the negotiating process.

Tajikistan has said that the existing borders needed to be reviewed and that it wanted the return of certain territories in the Oshskaya region of Kyrgyzstan. Since 1989, when clashes took place in the Batken region of Kyrgyzstan between Tajik and Kyrgyz citizens over the division of land, the two republics have been not been able to negotiate on the above matter.

A protocol on diplomatic relations and the exchange of embassies was, nevertheless, signed during Rakhmonov's visit to Bishkek. The two sides agreed to develop "traditional, friendly relations in political, economic and other spheres."

Kyrgyz Vice-President Feliks Kulov has described the talks in Bishkek with the Tajik leadership as productive. He told a press conference that the main positions on the draft treaty on inter-state relations had been established and that experts had been requested to give the document its finishing touches. Kulov said that economic

collaboration had been of great importance. After emphasising Kyrgyzstan's responsibility to its neighbour for granting humanitarian aid for the winter period, Kulov announced that the two sides had discussed methods and ways of delivering consignments of fuel and food to the neighbouring Gorno-Badakhshan region. The latter region's only access to the outside world is via the the Osh-Khorog highway.

The vice-president stressed that the border dispute would be resolved within the framework of international standards. This primarily concerns water and land disputes. He also considered that the parity commission founded in 1989 for the resolution of disputes between the Batken region of Kyrgyzstan and the Isfarin region of Tajikistan should resume its work. Kulov was of the view that disputes must not be resolved in a way which was detrimental to either of the two republics, especially the population of the border regions.

Rakhmonov expressed the hope that both sides would find a common language and that relations between the two would be decided this year.

When asked by INTERFAX where he thought the leaders of the Islamic opposition were currently located, Rakhmonov stated that the Tajik leadership was making attempts to invite them to talks and establish their whereabouts. He stressed, however, that no parties, including the Islamic party, were banned in Tajikistan.

IF Note: Meanwhile in Dushanbe, legal proceedings have begun against Muhammad Sharif Hematzoda, the leader of the Islamic Renaissance Party, Akbar Turajonzoda, head of Tajikistan's muslim clergy, and Shodmon Yusuf, the chairman of the Tajik Democratic Party.

Rakhmonov also said that he had high expectations that the Tajikistan issue would be discussed in a positive manner at the forthcoming Commonwealth summit in Minsk. He also stressed that Tajikistan's problems could not be resolved without assistance from Russia.

Diplomatic Relations Established

LD1501160593 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0100 GMT 15 Jan 93

[Excerpts] An official state delegation from the Republic of Tajikistan led by Imamali Rakhmonov, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, arrived in Bishkek city, the capital of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, following the conclusion of successful talks with the leadership of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The flags of the Republic of Tajikistan and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan were flying at Manas airport. The high-ranking Tajik guests were welcomed at the airport by Feliks Kulov, Vice President of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, and other state officials. [passage omitted]

Imamali Rakhmonov and Feliks Kulov held talks the same day, centering on ways of strengthening friendly and mutually advantageous relations between the fraternal peoples and states of Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan, the part that Kyrgyzstan can play to improve the situation in Tajikistan, and extending aid and the restoration of the economy of our republic. The talks were attended by members of the delegations of both countries.

Talks between the leaders of the two countries continued yesterday. Following this an agreement was signed on the bases of the interstate relations between the Republic of Tajikistan and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan. Similarly a protocol was signed on establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

A news conference was held following the talks.

President Makes Official Visit to Israel

OW1801161093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1524 GMT 18 Jan 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, Dmitriy Voskoboynikov, and Igor Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Askar Akayev left for Israel on an official visit on Monday [18 January] as the head of a governmental delegation. As DP [Diplomatic Panorama] learned from his Foreign Minister, Ednan Karabayev, Kyrgyzstan will submit to Israel a package of agreements on trade, economic, scientific, technical and cultural cooperation. There are plans to expand cooperation in education, health service, tourism, power engineering and air communication.

According to State Councillor Leonid Levitin, the possibility of cooperation in farming presents the greatest interest to Kyrgyzstan. There are plans to discuss joint projects in land improvement, drip irrigation, dairy cattle breeding, baby food production, vegetable and fruit processing.

Following his visit to Israel, on Friday and Saturday Karabayev will visit South Africa to discuss the ways to promote bilateral cooperation. The two countries have already established diplomatic relations. Kyrgyzstan is particularly interested in "South Africa's experience in reaching national reconciliation and gaining peace and stability within the country", the foreign minister told DP.

According to Karabayev, it's extremely important to discuss the possibility of working out concrete projects involving Kyrgyzstan's most important mining industries.

Economic Cooperation Stressed

LD1901075793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0603 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Zhudro]

[Text] Tel Aviv, 19 Jan—Kyrgyzstan President Askar Akayev arrived in Israel last night on an official three-day visit. The agenda of A. Akayev's stay in Israel includes meetings with President Hayim Herzog, Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin, and Knesset Speaker Shevah Weiss. The main aim of the visit is to help establish economic cooperation between independent Kyrgyzstan and Israel. Commenting on A. Akayev's visit, an Israeli Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed that Akayev is the first of the supreme leaders of the so-called "Muslim republics" of the former USSR to visit Israel.

Discusses Ties, Middle East Issues

LD1901144093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1328 GMT 19 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Zhudro]

[Text] Tel Aviv January 19 TASS—President Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan, who arrived in Israel on a three-day visit last night, was greeted in Jerusalem today. The high guest was welcomed by Israeli President Hayim Herzog. A guard of honour was mustered and the two countries' state anthems were played.

On the same day, Akayev met Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Rabin. He informed the Israeli head of government about the socio-economic situation in the republic and how reforms are being enacted. Akayev expressed his country's interest in forging equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation between Kyrgyzstan and Israel. For his part, Rabin dwelt on Middle Eastern problems and the state of the Israeli economy. He pointed to the danger of the growing strength of fundametalist Islamic movements which jeopardise the stability of several regional countries.

Rabin emphasised that the Israeli Government attaches great importance to the establishment of business contacts with independent states which emerged after the break-up of the Soviet Union.

Akayev also met and talked with Israeli Foreign Minister Shi'mon Peres.

Tajikistan

Hundreds Receive Military Training in Afghanistan

OW2101084493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0007 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] INTERFAX has been informed by Russian border troop headquarters in Dushanbe that 500 warriors from the Tajik Islamic Renaissance Party in Afghanistan have just completed their training. It is believed that "mass provocation" will take place around the border troops' outposts in the Khalton and Gorno-Badakhshan regions of Tajikistan.

The border troops, supported by the 201st Russian Division and special brigades from the Tajik National Security Committee, are preparing to resist incursions by the warriors into Tajik territory. Heavy artillery, aircraft, tanks and other armoured weaponry will be used against any attempt to break through the border.

The border troops have said that as many as 15,000 Tajik refugees have assembled on Afghan territory, close to the port of Shikhran on the river Panj. The refugees wished to return to their native land. Some Afghan officials were trying to prevent this by claiming that the Russian troops would detain and shoot them, and were provoking the refugees on their way back to their places of abode.

Various sources said that, in all, there were over 50,000 Tajik refugees in Afghanistan. These had crossed the border to avoid the hostilities in their homeland. 700 of these returned during the last week.

Islamic Troops Set To Invade

LD2101115993 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 1000 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Text] Some people are trying to return to the homeland, while others continue to threaten its security. A state of heightened combat readiness has been introduced for border guard units of the Russian Federation in Tajikistan, especially in the sector of the Moskovskiy Border guard detachment and at outposts of the Varvalkhskiy sector on the Tajik-Afghan border. A KHOVAR correspondent was told by the commander of border guards of the Russian Federation in Tajikistan, this measure is dictated by the fact that fighters on the territory of Afghanistan from the Islamic Rebirth Party of Tajikistan intend to organize provocations on that section of the state border. As the command noted, subunits of border troops, acting together with a special brigade of the National Security Committee of the republic and support detachments of the 201st Russian Motorized Rifle Division stationed in Tajikistan are prepared to prevent a breakthrough and infringement of the border by the fighters.

Muslim Head Said To Be Involved in Starting Civil War

OW2101092693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0016 GMT 21 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In his interview with INTERFAX on Wednesday [20 January] in Dushanbe, Imamali Rakhmonov, the parliament's chairman of Tajikistan, underlined that the involvement of Akbar Turajonzoda, the head of the Muslim clergy of Tajikistan, in the unleashing of the civil war "is more than proved." He pointed out that the government has collected "many testimonies about public appeals of Turajonzoda to the believers to sell their houses and cars in order to buy weapons." At

present an action was brought against the Muslims' head and several leaders of the Islamic Party of Revival who are accused of an attempt to forcibly overthrow the legal power. The investigation is being carried out in absentia because the whereabouts of the accused is unknown. They are supposed to be abroad Tajikistan and the CIS. [sentence as received]

Rakhmonov said that Tajikistan's government intends to revise the status of the Muslims' spiritual department in the republic and the procedure to elect its head. The Muslims' head is supposed to have the title of mufti and to be elected as a result of two-stage elections. The speaker stressed that the religious officials "should not be busy with politics and be involved in the state's affairs."

'Desperate Situation' of Tajik Refugees in Afghanistan

PM2001131793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jan 93 p 1

[Boris Vinogradov report: "Refugees in Afghanistan in Desperate Situation"]

[Text] The fact that individual groups of Tajiks have begun returning home from Afghanistan, where they ended up two or three months ago when escaping from the war, does not substantially alter the dramatic situation which has taken shape in the refugee camps on the left bank of the Amudarya and the Pyandzh.

Representatives of the International Red Cross Committee report that approximately 90,000 Tajiks are living under very difficult conditions in desert regions of the northern Afghan provinces. Cold and hunger and the shortage of medical supplies and tents are exacerbating their already desperate situation. International aid from the United Nations, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Russia, and other CIS countries is arriving in inadequate amounts and extremely irregularly. Deliveries are hampered by instability in the border regions, which are frequently controlled by various groupings.

Nevertheless, news agencies report that special committees to assist refugees have been set up in Mazar-e Sharif, the chief city of the Uzbek and Tajik ethnic minorities, who recently united in the "Movement for a National and Islamic Afghanistan." Agencies point out that one of the movement's leaders—General Rashid Dustum—is playing an active role in this.

At the same time the permanent representative of the Islamic State of Afghanistan at the United Nations has disseminated at the headquarters of the international community as an official document of the General Assembly a note containing an appeal for urgent assistance to be given to the Tajik refugees. The appeal states that at present Afghanistan itself is in an extremely difficult financial and economic position and cannot give support to the people who have left Tajikistan. It is proposed primarily to organize emergency deliveries of medicines, warm clothing, and food to the refugee camps.

A delegation from Dushanbe is now in Kabul and is holding talks with the Afghan authorities on the repatriation of compatriots. The course and subject of the talks are undoubtedly being influenced by the incessant rocket attacks on the capital by opposition groupings headed by G. Hekmatyar and other Islamic leaders. After receiving several aircraft from Delhi and Islamabad two days ago, Kabul Airport is closed again. Commentators believe that the traditional confrontation among the mujahidin will reach its apogee toward the end of January. Under these conditions the situation of the Tajik refugees in the north of the country could become still worse unless the necessary measures are taken.

Other sources report that the Tajiks' repatriation is being hindered by gunmen among the Islamic fundamentalists who have found shelter in Afghanistan. In this case they are using refugees as hostages. To all appearances, however, a crossing to the other bank of the Pyandzh is being organized. People are making their way to their homeland by improvising with anything that floats—motor vehicle tires, rafts, small boats. Approximately 120 people made the crossing in this way last Monday.

At the same time violations of the Tajik-Afghan border have become more frequent. The Russian Border Troops Press Service told us that an attempt to penetrate Tajik territory in the Pyandzh sector was made that same Monday by three Afghan groups. One intruder was arrested.

New Defense Minister Appointed

LD1901144693 Dushanbe Radio Dushanbe Network in Tajik 0400 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Text] Imamali Rakhmonov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tajikistan, held a conference yesterday that resolved the issue of the head of the Republic's military department. Acting on a proposal from Rakhmonov, (Aleksandr Ivanovich Shishmyanov) has been approved as Minister of Defense.

Rakhmonov Satisfied With Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan Visits

LD1701143693 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 17 Jan 93

[Text] Imamali Rakhmonov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, has highly assessed the results of a visit by a Tajikistani delegation to Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. He said that the official authorities in Alma-Ata and Bishkek declared their full support for the constitutionally elected government of Tajikistan. A treaty was concluded in Alma-Ata on the foundations for interstate relations with Kazakhstan.

In Bishkek, an agreement was signed establishing diplomatic relations with Kyrgyzstan. Intergovernmental agreements on commercial and economic cooperation were also signed.

The leaders of both republics have adopted decisions to supply Tajikistan with food products and other goods of vital importance, ITAR-TASS reports from Dushanbe.

Turkmenistan

Niyazov Favors Consultative Cooperation Within CIS

LD2001135893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1235 GMT 20 Jan 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Galzovskaya]

[Text] Ashgabat January 20 TASS—The stand of Turkmen President Saparmurad Niyazov concerning the CIS coordinating structures remains unchanged: He favours cooperation on a consultative basis, which rules out any command bodies, Durdymukhamet Kurban, press secretary of the president, told ITAR-TASS.

This stand is connected with deliberations on the future model of cooperation between the independent states, which will be formed on the basis of the current situation. Today it is obvious that the CIS member states seek to develop multilateral integration, along with the protection of their national interests. Turkmenistan does not contest the striving of the former union republics for unification, but, on the contrary, actively supports it.

The recent conference in Ashgabat, which discussed a single tariff for the transportation of Turkmen gas to Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan via Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan is a good example of the viability of such cooperation. The price of the transit, which became the subject of a controversy, was settled not with the help of some coordinating authority, but on the basis of bilateral agreements, which envisage the maximum of mutual commitments. According to Saparmurad Niyazov, the cooperation mechanism meets the basic interests of people, and it should be developed and upgraded.

The forthcoming Commonwealth summit in Minsk, the regional meeting, planned to be held in Ashgabat next April, as well as any other forthcoming contacts of heads of the independent states can and should help their people take to a new path of development, to gain peace and prosperity, the Turkmen president believes.

Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan Military Doctrine Discussed

PM2101124193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jan 93 p 3

[Report by Valentin Astafyev: "Uzbekistan Interested in Raising Prestige of Military Service"]

[Text] Tashkent—There has been a meeting at the Uzbekistan Defense Ministry between the republic's president, Islam Karimov, and the leading personnel of the Armed Forces. The meeting proceeded in camera but it has become known from reliable sources that it discussed a wide range of questions concerning the political situation in Uzbekistan and the Central Asia region. Special attention was paid to the problem of elaborating military doctrine and the concept of the organizational building, development, and reforming of the Republic of Uzbekistan Armed Forces under modern conditions. President Islam Karimov noted at the meeting that the content of the military doctrine which is being elaborated should be determined by Uzbekistan's peace-loving policy on the global and regional scale.

After a report delivered by Lieutenant General Rustam Akhmedov, the republic's defense minister, on the state of the troops' combat readiness, there was a discussion of the progress in implementing the laws "on defense" and "on universal military service obligation and military service," of the tasks of the further consolidation of military discipline, and problems of the social protection of servicemen and members of their families.

The edict of the republic's president on awarding the military title of major general to Aleksandr Surganov, directorate chief of the Defense Ministry, and to formation commanders Hero of the Soviet Union Aleksandr Soluyanov, Isakzhon Fazylov, and Yuriy Filonenko, and the title of aviation major general to Takhir Yusupov, first deputy commander of an air force formation, was read out at the meeting.

It was also announced that with a view to implementing the program to step up social protection for servicemen and members of their families the president of the Republic of Uzbekistan has signed a decree of the Cabinet of Ministers on a substantial increase as of 1 January this year in the salaries of servicemen and salaries for those with a military title.

Government Suspends Activities of Birlik Opposition Group

OW1901211893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1752 GMT 19 Jan 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Supreme Court of Uzbekistan suspended the activity of the popular opposition movement "Birlik" until April 15. The statement of the Justice Ministry pointed out that the abolition of the movement "is legal and expedient", because in the period from 1991 to 1993, for different violations of law, 166 members of "Birlik" were charged, and legal actions were brought against 20 people.

Meanwhile, one of the "Birlik" 's leaders, Shukhrat Ismatulayev declared to journalists that "pressure aimed at destroying the opposition is growing in the republic."

During the session of the Supreme Court, the second secretary of the US Embassy to Uzbekistan, Darya Fein, was forced to leave the courtroom. Raimkul Olimkulov, a lawyer in the court, declared that foreign citizens have no right to be present at the session of the Supreme Court.